

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXII

OCTOBER, 1929

NUMBER 4

FROM LOCKE TO REITZENSTEIN: THE HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY *

LUIGI SALVATORELLI

TURIN, ITALY

§ 1. THE DEISTS	263
§ 2. THE RATIONALISTS AND SCHLEIERMACHER	270
§ 3. LITERARY AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM; STRAUSS	280
§ 4. THE PERIOD OF THE TÜBINGEN SCHOOL	290
§ 5. GERMAN LIBERALISM; RENAN	298
§ 6. STUDIES IN THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT	313
§ 7. THE 'RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE SCHULE'	325
§ 8. LATER STUDIES; RADICAL CRITICISM	335
§ 9. 'FORMGESCHICHTE'; REITZENSTEIN	352

§ 1. THE DEISTS

THE historical investigation of the origins of Christianity began with the English deists, who, being philosophers and not professional historians, were for that very reason able to give the first forward impulse to the historical study of Jesus and of primitive Christianity. No purely historical interest could have induced Christian Europe to apply criticism to its sacred books, the facts of salvation, and the divine person of the Saviour. A new and philosophic conception of religion was required, directly opposed to the older view, if any serious effort was to be made to find in the writings of the New Testament and in the earliest Christian history the evidence for critically tested historical statements, and if these writings were to be read and the history studied from any other point of view than that of traditional dogmatism, Protestant or Catholic. Up to that time the two great Christian confessions had been in agreement as to the doctrines of revelation and inspiration; hence both

* This article was completed in June 1928, so that writings not then accessible are not included in the survey.

alike took for granted absolute unity of doctrine within the New Testament, and continuity and absolute agreement between Jesus and the apostles, and both accepted in its entirety and in its literal sense the whole narrative of the New Testament. Protestantism went, if anything, farther in this direction than Catholicism. Then appeared the English deists, seeking to introduce a new conception of revelation, according to which revelation and reason, the law of religion and the moral law of nature, were one and the same. This too was a dogmatic assumption, and one singularly ill-adapted for discovering the character and true spirit of the preaching of Jesus, of primitive Christianity, and of the New Testament writings. But the English deists were at least clear-sighted enough to recognize that the material in the New Testament, when taken as a whole, without discrimination, was not suited to their theory. Hence they had to apply to it a process of criticism and selection, which, though anti-historical in its purpose, yet, by reason of the methods and the particular views it adopted, opened the way to historical research properly so called.

Thus John Locke, in his "Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles by consulting St. Paul himself" (1705-1707),¹ which consisted of an annotated paraphrase of certain of the epistles of Paul, laid down the principle that Paul was to be interpreted by Paul, in accord with his specific use of language, and that instead of isolating the texts for use as loci theologici, his epistles ought to be read and interpreted in their entirety and in accordance with his own views. Locke had discovered the true basis of historical and critical exegesis; later we shall find that Wettstein refers to Locke, and that J. A. Ernesti confesses to having learned from him the correct method of exegesis. It was Locke again, in his "Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures" (1695),² who, in order to find the true content of Christianity, separated the gospels and Acts on the one hand from the epistles of the New Testament on the other. The purpose of the distinction and the standards by which it was made were those of rationalism rather than of

¹ In volume VII of Locke's Complete Works, 1823 ff.

² In volume VI of the same edition.

historical criticism, but the principle of a distinction between different strata and different tendencies within the New Testament and primitive Christianity had been affirmed.

This distinction within the sources was developed by John Toland, who, in his "Nazarenus, or Jewish, Gentile, and Mahometan Christianity" (1718), affirmed a distinction between Jewish Christians and gentile Christians and the identity of the first Christians (Jewish Christians) with the Nazarene and Hebrew heretics, although he later destroyed the value of his discovery in great part by supposing that the two types of Christianity existed peaceably side by side, and that the difference between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul lay only in the fact that they were addressed to two distinct classes of believers, while fundamentally they were identical.

Thomas Chubb, in "The True Gospel of Jesus Christ" (1738), followed in the footsteps of Locke by distinguishing the teaching of Jesus from the personal opinions of the apostles, as did also Thomas Morgan, in "The Moral Philosopher" (1737-1740), a dialogue between a deist follower of Paul and a judaizing follower of Peter, in which Paul is represented as the continuator of the teaching of Jesus. Morgan regarded Jesus' teaching as identical with the 'lex naturae' (that is, with deism), and held that it had been misunderstood and corrupted by the other apostles.

Such a representation of Jesus and Paul as deists will appear less extraordinary if we consider certain liberal Protestant interpretations of the message of Christianity, and we shall then see its great historical importance. This will be the more apparent when we see that Locke and Morgan assigned to the messianic element in the gospel a mere moral content, in distinction from the view commonly held by the Jews, and that Locke speaks of progressive stages in the preaching of Jesus due to motives of prudence, while Morgan admits a certain adaptation of Paul's doctrine of Christ to the conditions of the apostle's environment. This theory of 'accommodation,' destined to become of great importance in the nineteenth century, has not yet disappeared, and indeed there may be some truth in it.

If in this respect the deists appear as the precursors of liberal Protestantism, on another side they were preparing the way for pure criticism, and even for the audacities of Strauss. Thomas Woolson's criticism of the miracles of the gospel in his "Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour" (1727-1730) is based on allegorical interpretation, even including the resurrection, with the argument that a literal interpretation of miracles is absurd. Morgan, in "The Resurrection of Jesus, by a Moral Philosopher" (1744), denies that Jesus predicted his resurrection, and Peter Annet, in "The Resurrection of Jesus" (1744, anonymous), formulates the hypothesis of an apparent death. Conyers Middleton, in "A Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers" (1749), was less radical in his criticism of the gospel miracles but at the same time brought not only the question of miracle but the entire understanding of primitive Christianity into the field of comparative history,³ contrasting it with Judaism, paganism, and the modern sects, and thus anticipating modern tendencies by a century and a half.

Attacks of historical and literary criticism upon the separate books of the New Testament and on the canon were also not lacking. Annet questioned the genuineness of the epistles of Paul; Toland ("Amyntor," 1699) called in question the grounds on which the canon rested, applying the same standards to the canonical and to the apocryphal books of the New Testament; Chubb declared there was no proof that the New Testament belonged to the first period of the church or that the earliest Christians had any means of distinguishing the genuine gospels from the apocryphal.

What an abundance of critical hints were to be found in the deistic controversy is seen in Voltaire, who in his innumerable writings gathered them up, or rather disseminated them, with further development and fresh additions. Besides the ordinary remarks on the genealogies with their descent of Jesus from David, on the miracles, and on the contradictory statements of the evangelists, Voltaire made a slight attempt at criticism

³ The comparative method for the miracles was used by Hume also in his *Essay on Miracles*, No. 10 in the *Philosophical Essays concerning Human Understanding*, 1748, later entitled, *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*.

of the sources in his doubts as to the apostolic authorship of the writings of the New Testament, including the epistles of Paul, and in his dating of the gospels after the capture of Jerusalem. He also sketched the religious conditions of Judaea at the beginning of the Christian era, with its division into a multiplicity of sects, and attempted a reconstruction of the work and figure of Jesus, making him the head of a new Jewish sect opposed to the others and denying to him any purpose of founding a new religion or a church with dogmas and sacraments. Voltaire outlined the history of the dogma of the divinity of Christ, from the idea of the Son of God, interpreted in a Jewish sense, to the definitions of the Council of Nicaea; he insisted on the Jewish character of the first Christian community, brought out the importance of the eschatological element in primitive Christianity and its agreement with widely diffused beliefs of the pagan world of that time, suggested the comparison with pagan myths in connection with the belief in the resurrection of Jesus and the descensus ad inferos, and showed the importance for the diffusion of Christianity of the monotheism of the mysteries.⁴ But in Voltaire organic comprehension and systematic treatment are almost wholly lacking. His method is that of polemical fire-works. Statements, reasonable, disputable, or even altogether groundless, follow one another and are mingled together in endless confusion, but always remain dogmatic pronouncements or witty paradoxes. When we read that Jesus was "an Israelite theist," as Socrates was an Athenian theist, or worse still find Jesus defined as "a good fellow who had the weakness to want to be talked about and who did not like the priests of his time," and the Apostle Paul treated as an unbalanced enthusiast, it is quite clear that in Voltaire a passion for destruction and an anti-christian animus had got the better of historical research and understanding. Even in the field of literary criticism, his statements that the

⁴ These statements of Voltaire's occur in many passing allusions, frequently repeated. Besides his articles, 'Christianisme,' 'Messie,' 'Miracles,' in the *Dictionnaire philosophique*, mention may be made of his *Catéchisme de l'honnête homme*; *Examen de Milord Bolingbroke*; *Dieu et les hommes*, (chapters 31-38); and especially *Histoire de l'établissement du christianisme* (1777), which is a compendium of Voltaire's opinions on this subject.

canonical gospels were later than the apocryphal, and his use of the late Jewish compilation of popular tales, 'Toledoth Jeshua,' on an equal footing with the Synoptics, show how many weeds were mixed with the wholesome grain of his erudition.

A German deist, contemporary with Voltaire, Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768),⁵ professor of oriental languages at Hamburg, undertook the systematic historical study of the religion of the Old and New Testaments from the point of view of deism, a study which Voltaire had not made and probably was not capable of making. The whole work of Reimarus has never been published, but the part which concerns us was brought out by Lessing in 1774 and 1778 as "fragments of an anonymous writer" under the two special titles, "Concerning the Resurrection" and "Of the Purpose of Jesus and his Disciples."⁶ The first treatise is really a part of the second, which is intended as a consistent reconstruction of the work of Jesus and his disciples. According to Reimarus, the gospel of Jesus consisted solely in preaching the imminence of the kingdom of God and calling for conversion in view of it. By kingdom of God Jesus meant what the Jews of his time meant — an earthly domination, a political Messiah. This Messiah Jesus hoped to become through the favor of the people, and the entry into Jerusalem was planned with this purpose; but the attempt failed and ended with his crucifixion. The disciples, having come to like the new life and wishing to continue in it, took away his body by stealth, preached his resurrection, and for the conception of the earthly, political Messiah substituted another which had been present in Judaism from the time of Daniel, that of the transcendent Messiah. They thus gave to the death of Jesus the significance of the redemption of humanity. The

⁵ On Reimarus and his works, see Strauss, Hermann Samuel Reimarus und seine Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes (1862), in vol. V of his *Gesammelte Schriften*, pp. 229-409.

⁶ The fragment, 'Ueber die Auferstehung,' is the fifth of those published under the general title: 'Ein Mehreres aus den Papieren des Ungenannten, die Offenbarung betreffend,' in *Zur Geschichte und Literatur. Aus den Schätzen der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel. Vierter Beitrag*, 1777 (vol. XII of *Sämtliche Schriften*, edited by Lachmann, 3rd edition revised by Müncker). 'Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger. Noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten' was published separately in 1778 (vol. XIII of *Sämtliche Schriften*).

community of property attracted followers to them, and in this way the first Christian community was formed.

It cannot be denied that in its bold acceptance of all the implications of its radical premises this first attempt to reconstruct historically the origin of Christianity possesses a certain grandeur, but we ought not, with Schweitzer, to exaggerate its merits and ignore its weak points.⁷ The clear affirmation of the eschatological element in the preaching of Jesus, the attempt to interpret his actions and especially his going to Jerusalem from this point of view, the understanding of the historical and religious problem of the relation in the minds of believers between Jesus on earth and Jesus risen, the idea of a transformation of the messianic idea connected with the experience of the passion and the resurrection — all this, together with the author's observations in detail, constitutes a very valuable step in advance which makes Reimarus, at least in tendency, a forerunner of modern criticism. But every one of the vital elements in his constructive work is marred and made sterile by the one-sidedness of his outlook and his rationalistic and anti-christian preconceptions. Still more than the mistake of his purely political interpretation of the messiahship of Jesus (an error which Schweitzer himself points out) his denial of any originality in the religious thought of Jesus and especially his representation of insincerity and theatrical artifice as substantial elements in the conduct of Jesus and his disciples, with the consequent debasement of them all to the level of mere impostors, prevent the constructive work of Reimarus from having any value as history. By his view that Christianity arose through a prearranged plan and by intentional deceit on the part of persons moved by selfish interests, Reimarus, in spite of his historical ability, remained within the circle of the rationalistic and anti-historical method. For that reason what was published by Lessing was incapable of exerting positive influence, and by the reaction it created tended rather to retard the progress of thought.⁸

⁷ *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, pp. 23 ff., a new edition (1913) of Von Reimarus zu Wrede (1906). This work is fundamental for the history of writings on the life of Jesus, and will be referred to henceforth as 'Schweitzer.'

⁸ This observation is made by Schweitzer, who exemplifies it (p. 26) by the attitude of Semler.

§ 2. THE RATIONALISTS AND SCHLEIERMACHER

Deism had a permanent significance for the historical study of the origins of Christianity because it completely discarded every transcendental presupposition of revelation and inspiration⁹ and treated the Christian story as purely human history and the books of the New Testament like any other historical documents. But, especially in the extreme form exhibited by Voltaire, it went so far in its crusade against the church as actually to destroy the human value of the history and the documents by representing the whole as a fantastic imposture. Too passionate a denial that they were a revelation resulted in a denial of their human character. To rescue the history of Christian origins from the blind alley into which deism had driven it two things were necessary: a serious effort to understand in its objective reality and logical consistency the process by which Christianity grew, and a scientific, analytical study of the New Testament. The latter task was logically the consequence of the former, but in fact it had to be performed first.

Some steps toward the critical study of the New Testament had been taken in the first half of the seventeenth century, before the rise of deism. Hugo Grotius, in his "*Annotationes ad Vetus et Novum Testamentum*" (1644-49), had already interpreted the Bible by philological and not dogmatic methods and had explained passages in the gospels and other books of the New Testament by comparison with the phraseology of Greek and Latin authors. On the other hand, rabbinical Judaism had been made to contribute to the same end by the English theologian John Lightfoot (whose sympathies were strictly conservative) in his "*Horae hebraicae et talmudicae*" (1658-78). More systematically arranged and somewhat bolder was the work of the French Roman Catholic oratorian Richard Simon, who in his "*Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau*

⁹ English deism did not completely deny revelation, at least it did not in the phase represented by Locke and Toland, and Locke admitted the concept of inspiration to a certain degree. But by making revelation equivalent to '*lex naturae*,' the transcendentalist assumption was nullified, and in fact deistic criticism and interpretation wholly neglected it. When Voltaire speaks freely, he treats the dogma of revelation as not even deserving to be refuted.

Testament" (1689), "Histoire critique des versions du Nouveau Testament" (1690), and "Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament" (1693),¹⁰ not only treated the text of the New Testament critically (proving, for instance, that the ending of Mark, the pericope adulterae, and the clause concerning the three heavenly witnesses were not authentic), but even formulated and tried to solve questions of higher criticism, and (what is still more important) adopted in his method a strictly historical point of view. Later, a Genevan Protestant, Jean Alphonse Turretin,¹¹ in his "*De sacrae scripturae interpretandae methodo*" (1728), declared that the method of interpretation of the sacred Scriptures must be based on the rules of ordinary criticism. The principle of referring to classical writers for the interpretation of the New Testament already employed by Grotius was systematically applied to all the books by the Dutch-Swiss theologian Johann Jakob Wettstein, in his "*Novum Testamentum graecum cum lectionibus variantibus et commentario pleniore*," published at Amsterdam in 1751-52.

One who should go no farther than these single cases and their superficial appearance might conclude that earlier than the rationalistic and destructive criticism of the deists and coincidently with it both Catholic and Protestant theology had of their own accord entered on a course of philological and historical criticism. But the truth is that the critical approaches made by such men as Grotius, Simon, and Turretin were imperfect and limited in scope, and were nowhere in the theological world systematically followed up or developed. Since on the one hand these scholars remained firmly attached to the traditional premises of theology, and on the other a new historical and philosophical synthesis was still lacking, their critical analysis either exhausted itself in details or more often ran out into a mere exhibition of learning. A new synthesis, which was essential for giving new life to historical and philological research, was the contribution of deism. Under its influence a

¹⁰ The first and second volumes were completed by the *Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du Nouveau Testament*, 1695.

¹¹ The Turretini were originally from Lucca.

new critical theology sprang up in Germany, of which Johann Salomon Semler (1725–91) should be considered the founder. At the same time his teacher Sigmund Jakob Baumgarten (brother of the writer on esthetics), notwithstanding his scientific training and his adherence to the principles of Wolff's philosophy, remained purely traditional in exegesis no less than in dogma,¹² and upheld the inviolability of the Received Text of the New Testament and the authenticity of the passage of the three heavenly witnesses.

Two somewhat older contemporaries of Semler, Johann August Ernesti (1707–1781)¹³ and Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791),¹⁴ were already under the influence of deism and made no secret of it — the former, as we have seen, declaring that he had learned the correct method of exegesis from Locke, the latter attributing a decisive influence to his sojourn in England. Although Ernesti, coming to theology from philological studies, had the merit of introducing once for all the principle of philological and historical exegesis, he yet maintained the dualism of philology and theology, declared that the theologian "*velut personas sustinet duas, alteram communem cum grammaticis, alteram suam et propriam*," and accounted for the difficulties of interpretation of the sacred Scriptures by "*ingenii humani et rationis imbecillitas*." His own method was on the whole harmonistic, and he attributed to direct divine inspiration the whole religious content of the New Testament. For him as for Michaelis the dogmatic principle of inspiration remained an integral part of 'Introduction' to New Testament study, although not in its traditional form and importance. According to Michaelis inspiration¹⁵ is restricted to the apostolic writings; since not all the books of the canon are really works of the apostles, he endeavored to examine the historical credi-

¹² Both the *Biblische Hermeneutik* and the *Glaubenslehre* of Baumgarten were published posthumously by Bertram and Semler.

¹³ Some of his *Opuscula philologica critica* (1764) and *Opuscula theologica* (1773) are of interest here, but more especially his *Institutio interpretis Novi Testamenti* (1761).

¹⁴ See his *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes* (1750; 4th ed., 1788).

¹⁵ He declares, however, that inspiration is not indispensable for Christianity. See *Einleitung*, 4th ed., §§ 13–15 (vol. I, pp. 73–101).

bility of the New Testament books independently of all considerations of apostolic character and inspiration.

An attempt to reestablish the unity of method broken by Ernesti's and Michaelis's dualism of history (including philology) and theology was made by Semler by resolving theology into history.¹⁶ He made a distinction (and in this was the precursor of the 'modernism' of our day) between the essential and permanent element in religion and the formulation of it, varying with place and time, which is the content of theology. Semler's distinction, evidently suggested to him by the efforts of the deists to find the original nucleus of the rational and moral essence of Christianity, represents the first development in an historical direction of the rationalistic method of deism. From this came a radical transformation of the conception of inspiration and finally the new method of conceiving the New Testament as formed gradually from diverse and even opposite elements blended into a final synthesis. Jewish-Christian spirit is reflected in the gospels, the spirit of universality in the epistles of Paul, while the Catholic epistles represent a harmonizing of these two elements. Thus the New Testament was brought within the history of primitive Christianity, and the Tübingen school was anticipated by three quarters of a century. But — and here theology comes in again — both currents, ebionite and Pauline, led back to the same point, a two-fold teaching of Jesus, addressed to different hearers. Thus the theory of 'adaptation,' with its implicit idealistic interpretation of the gospel, was taken up again from the first form of deism, but with a step beyond Toland, who had assumed the official peaceful co-existence of the two currents. A purely historical comprehension of the internal development of Christianity had not yet been reached. In Semler systematic thinking was still lacking and the interest in practical religion was still dominant. We can see why he took an attitude of uncompromising opposition to the radicalism of the anonymous Wolfenbüttel fragmentist; and in the last years of his life, with the aid of what he deemed

¹⁶ The two works of Semler that are most important for us are his *Apparatus ad liberalem Novi Testamenti interpretationem* (1767) and especially his *Abhandlung von der freien Untersuchung des Kanons* (1771-1776).

the necessary distinction between official, public religion and private, moral religion, he ranged himself with the orthodox conservatives, although without entirely regaining their favor.

In the investigation of Christian origins Reimarus and Semler represent the two high points reached by philosophers and theologians respectively under the direct influence of deism. Each of the two thinkers corrects and completes the other. Reimarus, in his interpretation of Jesus and the first Christian community, passed from the rationalistic abstractions of the deists to the extreme of historical realism; but by denying as well to Jesus as to the community any spiritual originality or genuine religious motive, he finally reduced the origin of Christianity to an affair of adventurers and impostors, making it more incomprehensible than ever. On the one hand he successfully broke away from the anti-historical method of the deists, but on the other he, like them and even more than they, failed to understand the facts of religion and hence its history.

Semler saw that in primitive Christianity an external element, dependent on circumstances of place and time, was associated with an original element which was the actual propulsive force, and thus he was able to point out exactly the problem that has to be solved to-day by the student of the origins of Christianity. Of the former of these two elements Semler had some idea, although in the limitations of the historical knowledge of his time it was necessarily incomplete and one-sided. For the understanding of the second he remained too much under the influence of rationalistic deism, and this was still more the case with regard to the relation between the two elements, which was understood as an external coëxistence produced by the voluntary act of an individual, namely Jesus, and not as an organic connection, the result as well as the cause of the whole historical development.

The work of Reimarus and Semler was not carried to completion. The views of the former were summarily rejected; the latter was not understood in his more profound thought. To the philosophical rationalism of the deists succeeded the exegetical, apologetic rationalism of the theologians, its aim

being, on the one hand, to save as much as possible of the traditional inheritance of Christianity, and on the other, to change the outward form of Christianity to suit the demands of reason. With this kind of rationalism, instead of the writings of the New Testament being analyzed, characterized, and used as historical documents, according to the beginning made by deism and by Semler, they came again to be treated as a single whole, all standing on the same level. The historical facts were purely and simply what was contained in these writings, and to ascertain what actually was contained in them was the task of rationalistic exegesis. This exegesis, in brief, adhered firmly to the letter of the New Testament writings, especially the gospels, and interpreted their meaning and their connection not according to the general context and the thought of the writers, objectively ascertained, but according to the demands of a naturalistic explanation acceptable to the rationalism of the end of the eighteenth century. It was accepted as a fact that Jesus had been seen by the three disciples on the mountain, conversing with two persons; but these interpreters said that although the two persons were supposed by the disciples to be Moses and Elias, they were in reality true living persons, whose names Jesus never revealed. It was a fact that Jesus had distributed a few loaves of bread and a few fishes to his followers, and that at the same time the multitude who had gathered to hear him were fed; but that result was reached only because, imitating Jesus and the disciples, the multitude put all their own provisions into a common stock and distributed them. Jesus actually came out from the tomb and was several times in the company of his disciples; he simply had not died on the cross. The last time that he blessed them on the Mount of Olives and withdrew, a cloud hid him; his disappearance was interpreted as an 'ascension,' and no one knew where or how he finally died. And so on; the device was to distinguish between the facts as narrated in the gospels and the interpretations, or 'judgments,' of those facts by the writers of the gospels.

This distinction between 'facts' and 'judgment' was made the keystone of the structure of New Testament exegesis and

of the history of primitive Christianity by Heinrich Eberhard Paulus (1761–1851), the patriarch of theological rationalism, and the examples we have given are taken from him. His system of exegesis in all its details is contained in his “*Exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien*,” which appeared in 1830 and the following years — on the eve, therefore, of Strauss’s “*Leben Jesu*” — but it had been preceded thirty years before by Paulus’s commentary on the whole New Testament, including these same gospels. Paulus’s guiding principles were explained clearly and at length in the preface and introduction to the *Handbuch*. It would be wrong to treat with contempt the great mass of material which he accumulated — he himself justly observed that it could be of use to everyone, of whatever party — or to represent all his principles as fantastic and useless. Moreover, underlying his whole work is a moral principle which deserves respect, namely, that there shall be harmony between faith and reason, which means respect for one’s own conscience and sincere consistency in one’s own ideas. Another basic principle of great weight is contained in his statement that the texts of the New Testament are one thing, and the interpretations put upon them in the *loci theologici* (and even earlier in the patristic writings) another, and that the primitive significance of the texts must be recovered by philological and historical exegesis. But he applied this thoroughly reasonable principle negatively, as against traditional dogma, rather than positively so as to reconstruct objectively the process of formation of Christianity. By separating ‘facts’ and ‘judgment’ to the point of accepting the letter of the texts in their entirety while rejecting their spirit, Paulus reduced the fact itself to a mere shell without a kernel, to a façade without any building behind it. By this process he made impossible the understanding of those religious convictions which had certainly been the constructive forces of the Christian organization. To be sure, their omission was not absolute, as is shown in his “*Leben Jesu*,”¹⁷ which appeared two

¹⁷ *Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1828, two volumes, the second containing a German translation of the synopsis of the four gospels.

years before the *Exegetisches Handbuch*. In the introduction to the *Handbuch* he gives an account, not without value, of theocratic and messianic ideas in Israel and in Judaism, in which due prominence is given to the appearance (attributed to the time of the Maccabees) of the idea of the Messiah as a celestial spirit instead of an earthly king; and in defining Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God he includes the belief in a transcendental, external transformation. But this element of concrete historical thinking still remains within the circle of the theory of accommodation, and Paulus strengthened the tendency which had existed before his time and has continued dominant ever since, naïvely to identify the original religious element of the gospel with the modern spiritualistic interpretation of it. His own rationalistic explanation of the 'facta salutaria,' especially the resurrection of Jesus, coincides with his failure to realize that such facts had any great value in connection with the moral and religious preaching of Jesus. He rated the theory of an 'apparent' death so highly, because he did not perceive that such an explanation left unsolved the fundamental historical and religious problems of belief in the resurrection and of the paramount influence of this belief in the experience and historical development of Christianity. He did not himself consider the belief of importance, and he naïvely imputed his own state of mind to the primitive Christians. In this respect Paulus was as far from an understanding of the history of the origins of Christianity as he was near to the later liberal German theology. In this respect even Harnack adopted substantially the same point of view as Paulus.

Nevertheless, it was not from Paulus that liberal Protestant theology in Germany inherited this indifference to the fundamental beliefs and experiences of primitive Christianity and to the 'Heilstatsachen' of the original Christian faith, but rather from Schleiermacher. Likewise it was Schleiermacher's religious philosophy, which we might rather term a transcendental sentimentalism, and not Paulus's moral rationalism, that influenced this theology in its view of the religious character of Jesus and of primitive Christianity. This is not the place to

summarize or to appraise the religious philosophy of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), still less to describe its development, or, as some would think, its degradation, from the first edition of the "Reden" (1799) to the second, profoundly modified (1806), and to "Der christliche Glaube" (1821), with its second edition, also greatly changed (1830), more commonly called the "Glaubenslehre." But we may recall that in accordance with Schleiermacher's extra-temporal, anti-historical, subjective, individualistic conception of religion, his Jesus, especially as pictured in the *Glaubenslehre*, is an entirely abstract being, a dialectic, mystical, and almost vaporous form of the Logos of the Gospel of John (which on the contrary has a distinct religious reality of its own), a prototype of humanity, the ideal Man become a reality at a certain moment in history.

The central point in Schleiermacher's christology is the view that in Jesus the human and the divine are equally real, equally removed from and superior to the conceptions both of ebionism and of docetism. But this view was stated in an abstract form; it was a purely dialectic process, lacking personal individuality and historical consistency.¹⁸ In theory Schleiermacher did not deny the value of historical criticism; indeed his "Einleitung in das Neue Testament"¹⁹ expressly defends it (§ 6), and he there formulates correctly the fundamental task of exegesis, "to put one's self in the position of the first readers of the New Testament" (§ 4). The introduction to his *Leben Jesu*²⁰ affirms the necessity of a purely historical conception of Jesus. He made, however, very little use of criticism himself, with the exception of a small number of single questions. The treatment of the sources in his *Life of Jesus* is that of an extreme conservative, and the Fourth Gospel

¹⁸ The idea of an historical theology was entirely foreign to Schleiermacher, as is shown by his *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums* (1810; 2nd ed., 1830), where theology is treated as a body of ideas belonging to different branches of learning, put together for the practical purpose of the guidance of the church.

¹⁹ Published posthumously in 1845 from lectures of 1829, 1831, 1832.

²⁰ A course of lectures of 1832, published posthumously in 1864. Since Schleiermacher did not read his lectures from a fully worked-out manuscript, these posthumous publications cannot be considered accurate in all particulars, but the general lines are certainly to be trusted. For his *Leben Jesu*, however, we have the author's own notes.

is the basis and inspiration, as he says himself, of his christology. In the *Life of Jesus* he shows an extraordinary indifference to the reality of the events, as well as to their meaning for those who took part in them. He denies the importance of the baptism of Jesus, lest he should seem to take a gnostic or rationalistic position. The miracles of Jesus belong to the external side of his life no less and no more than the mention of the places that he visited or the means by which he lived.²¹ On the eucharist we have a theological discussion and a symbolic interpretation. As to the death of Jesus, which of course involves his resurrection, it is said to be not only impossible but even quite unimportant to determine whether it was real or apparent.²² Of the ascension he gives a spiritualistic explanation. No attempt is made to understand what the faith of Jesus and of his followers meant to them; it is interpreted according to the subjective requirements of the author. The contingent element is explicitly and even emphatically admitted in theory, but entirely ignored in practice. In Jesus he sees "the consciousness of God, absolute and exclusive," although he admits within this consciousness a development of a purely internal character. The doctrine of the kingdom of God is reduced to the simple statement that the communion with God founded by Jesus included also blessedness. There is no real development from Jesus to the Christian church; the apostles taught nothing that they had not learned from their Master; only their manner of setting the doctrine forth may have been different, according to their personality and in consequence of circumstances.

In a word, Schleiermacher's *Life of Jesus* is plainly a work of theological philosophy. None of the real historical problems is

²¹ In Schleiermacher's mind the important thing is to understand the miracles morally. What he says of the miracle at Cana is typical: "We cannot comprehend it in its physical aspect, but if Christ was able to produce such an effect, we must understand his action as a moral fact and we can present no objection" (p. 222).

²² This agrees with the *Glaubenslehre*, where it is said that the resurrection and ascension are not integral parts of the doctrine of the person of Christ (§ 99). But what is permissible in the field of dogma and philosophy cannot be admitted in the field of history, in which it is essential to know what the resurrection and the ascension meant to the Christian consciousness. Schleiermacher, with his indifference to history, attributed to that consciousness his own dogmatic point of view.

approached. The personality and conduct of Jesus are interpreted solely from the spiritualistic point of view, and without any relation to the environment; such relationship is indeed explicitly denied in the affirmation that Jesus must have been self-instructed, and had received no influence from the messianic belief of Daniel. Not to speak of Reimarus or Semler, even in comparison with Paulus Schleiermacher represents a long step backward. It is true that his *Life of Jesus* was first published more than thirty years after his death, but its contents had been given out in his courses of lectures and circulated in the notes of his pupils, and its fundamental ideas correspond to those of his classic *Glaubenslehre*, and in general to the whole spirit of his teaching and his published work. Since both of these had an enormous influence (and the influence of his writings is still great), we are safe in saying that Schleiermacher's conception of Jesus and of the gospel has a fundamental importance in the history of the theological and historical writings concerning the origins of Christianity that appeared in Germany in the nineteenth century.

§ 3. LITERARY AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM; STRAUSS

If the period between Semler and Strauss had produced only general works, of the type of those we have just been examining, the balance sheet of the whole period would have shown a net loss, and for any understanding of the historical problems we should have to follow Schweitzer in looking to the romanticizing lives of Jesus by Bahrdt and Venturini.²³ These lives, with their fanciful accounts of a secret connection of Jesus with the esenes and of the influence of the latter in his life and death, show at least some consciousness of a mysterious, extra-rational element in the origins of Christianity, and of the need of an explanation outside of the plain gospel story and of the spiritualistic or rationalistic interpretation of it. Fortunately, though Semler had no immediate successor in the strictly his-

²³ K. F. Bahrdt, *Ausführung des Plans und Zwecks Jesu* (1784-1792). K. H. Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazareth* (1800-1802). On these, see Schweitzer, chapter IV.

torical part of his work, the outline of the first development of Christianity, yet he had a very decisive influence on the formal method of works on Introduction to the New Testament. From his time on these studies were put on a true scientific basis and used the historical and literary method in dealing with questions of text, authorship, date, and composition of the several books.

This made possible the independent and systematic critical analysis of the sources of the gospels, that necessary foundation for the reconstruction of Christian origins. Special problems, and various solutions for them, were not slow in emerging. The first and most important problem for the story of Jesus — the Synoptic problem — was clearly formulated in a number of theories. In 1776 Johann Jakob Griesbach provided, in his "*Synopsis evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci et Lucae*," a substitute for the ancient 'harmony.' The latter had sought to combine the four gospels into a single narrative; the modern 'synopsis' limits itself to setting the parallel passages side by side for critical comparison. For this purpose Griesbach used the three 'synoptics' (whence their name) distinguishing them sharply from the fourth gospel. It is interesting to note that this grouping, which is a milestone on the road of gospel criticism, came at almost exactly the same time as the publication of the fragments of Reimarus. The two currents, of literary and of historical criticism, began to flow at the same time, and thenceforth continued in close and continuous contact and interrelation, but without completely uniting, even in our own day. Under the influence of Reimarus, Lessing, considering the evangelists as "purely human writers," formulated his "new hypothesis" ²⁴ of a primitive gospel from which the three Synoptics had borrowed and to which John had deliberately set in opposition his own more ideal gospel. The theory of a primitive gospel was taken up and developed by Eichhorn ²⁵ in

²⁴ *Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten als blos menschliche Schriftsteller betrachtet* (written in 1778, but published posthumously in 1784).

²⁵ Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1804 ff.; 2nd ed., 1820 ff.). Eichhorn admitted the existence of a number of documents prior to the Synoptics.

a very complicated form; while Griesbach²⁶ formulated the rival theory of 'utilization,' which was destined eventually to triumph but in a form different from his. He held Mark to be an epitomator of Matthew and Luke, a theory which remained predominant for many decades without being shaken from its position either by the theory of a single primitive written gospel or by that of a comprehensive oral tradition. This last theory, originating with Herder,²⁷ who made the evangelists to be the rhapsodists of a primitive Christian saga, was systematized by Gieseler,²⁸ whose important contribution was to account for supposed modified forms of an oral tradition, corresponding to the three Synoptics, by the action of the diverse tendencies present in early Christianity. Luke, for instance, is a 'Pauline' gospel. Still less success attended Schleiermacher's idea, which he himself abandoned later, that the Synoptics were the product of a great number of short pieces stitched together.²⁹

Every sort of critical question began to appear. Eichhorn, as a natural consequence of the great number of antecedent documents which he assumed to have existed, assigned the canonical gospels to a late date. He even went so far as to affirm that the gospels did not begin to be used before the end of the second century (*Einleitung*, I, 2nd ed., p. 153), and accepted the theory, which had been advanced before and was afterwards adopted by the Tübingen school, that the gospel of Marcion was the source of Luke. The narratives of the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke were discussed, and abandoned by many. Studies were made of the original significance and the authenticity of the accounts of the baptism, the temptation, and the miracles. Herder recognized the radical difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth

²⁶ *Commentatio qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis deceptum esse monstratur* (1789-1790).

²⁷ *Von den Regeln der Zusammenstimmung unserer Evangelien* (1797). This is an appendix to *Von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland: Nach Johannis Evangelium*, which had been preceded by *Vom Erlöser der Menschen: Nach unsren drei ersten Evangelien* (1796). For these two works, see Schweitzer, chapter III.

²⁸ *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (1818).

²⁹ *Kritischer Versuch über die Schriften des Lukas* (1817).

Gospel, and consequently treated separately the Christ of the former group and the Christ of John. The Johannine problem, foreshadowed by Herder, who however accepted the traditional theory of the origin of the Fourth Gospel, was formulated in critical terms by Bretschneider in his "Probabilia" (1820),³⁰ although in the form of queries which found no approval at the time and were in the end disavowed by their author. Schleiermacher uncompromisingly upheld the genuineness and historical credibility of the Fourth Gospel, from which, as we have seen, he drew his main guidance and inspiration.³¹ On the other hand, in the literary criticism of Paul Schleiermacher was in advance of others, declaring that the First Epistle to Timothy was not genuine.³² Eichhorn, in his *Einleitung*, said the same of all three of the Pastoral Epistles, and he was followed by W. M. L. DeWette.³³ The last named even contested for a time the authenticity of Second Thesalonians, as J. E. C. Schmidt had already done,³⁴ and following Usteri³⁵ argued also against that of the Epistle to the Ephesians.³⁶ Finally, criticism of the sources of the Acts of the Apostles was undertaken.³⁷

Textual criticism began earlier than literary criticism. The *Textus Receptus* of the Greek New Testament, as it had first taken shape in the sixteenth century in the editions of Erasmus and the Complutensian Polyglot, was reprinted for many generations with slight changes in the successive editions of Robert Stephen, Beza, and the house of Elzevir, not to mention minor

³⁰ *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine eruditorum iudicii modeste subiecit Carolus Theophilus Bretschneider.*

³¹ The views of Schleiermacher are found in the posthumous *Einleitung*, §§ 80-84.

³² *Ueber den sogenannten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus* (1807).

³³ *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (1826). DeWette, however, acknowledged that some genuine fragments were used in the Pastoral Epistles.

³⁴ *Vermutungen über die beiden Briefe an die Thessalonicher* (1798).

³⁵ *Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffes* (1824).

³⁶ In the *Einleitung*, and especially in his *Kurze Erklärung des Ephesierbriefs* (1843).

³⁷ Königsman, *Prolusio de fontibus commentariorum sacrorum qui Lucae nomen praeferunt* (1798). Schleiermacher discussed the sources of Acts in a course of lectures in 1817, the substance of which was incorporated in the posthumous publication of his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*.

editors and printers. But criticism of this text, after tentative beginnings and much accumulation of materials both on the continent and in England, was definitely established by Richard Simon at the end of the seventeenth century.

Not until the edition of J. A. Bengel appeared (1734) was any serious effort made to print a text which should deliberately select the best reading on critical principles, and even Bengel's chief distinction lay in his attempt to distribute the witnesses into families. This was carried farther by Semler (1765), and more fully elaborated, with great critical acumen and knowledge, by Griesbach, whose edition of 1774 was the first important critical text to be published. In 1831 the edition of the philologist Karl Lachmann, in a purely historical spirit, completely cut loose from the *Textus Receptus* with the construction of a new text based solely on the oldest Greek manuscripts and the ancient Latin versions. Ten years later (1841) came the first edition of Konstantin von Tischendorf. This brief outline of the history of textual study in the period between Semler and Strauss shows how the inviolability of the traditional text was definitely eliminated, in both theory and practice, and thereby one obstacle removed to the historical and literary criticism of the New Testament and of the origins of Christianity.

The value of all this work on the exegesis and text of the New Testament in the period mentioned ought to receive full recognition. It not only prepared the materials for the historical reconstruction, but it enlarged men's thoughts and accustomed them to examine and discuss on purely philological and historical grounds every text of the New Testament and of the records of early Christianity. On the other hand, the work was still preliminary in character, since what is ultimately of interest is evidently not who wrote the Synoptic gospels and when, but what do these books contain, as sources of historical knowledge. It is not enough for a student of history to read a text of the Acts that is critically exact; he must learn to draw from it the elements of his reconstruction of history. This principle of historical method is obvious, and has not been disputed by

theological critics since the days of Semler, but we can hardly say that it has been fully applied in their work. If we consider the whole body of writings on Christian origins produced in such abundance by German scholarship in the period from Semler to Strauss and still more abundantly in succeeding periods, we cannot fail to be struck by the predominance of 'Introductions' and monographs of an 'introductory' character, as compared with historical works properly so called. The 'Einleitung in das Neue Testament,' instead of being, as it should be, primarily an auxiliary and preparatory study to the history of Christian origins, has assumed the rôle of an autonomous science. It is natural to compare it with the history of Greek or Latin literature, since these also are not treated as subordinate to the political history of Greece or Rome but as having their own *raison d'être* and their own life; and the comparison holds good provided we remember that the New Testament canon constitutes a unity for theological, not literary, reasons. For this reason Introduction to the New Testament did not become in the nineteenth century, and shows no sign of becoming to-day, a history of primitive Christian literature, to say nothing of having been absorbed into the history of Christian origins. To be sure, the New Testament canon is an historical fact; but if the books on Introduction had treated it under this aspect, they would have become mere histories of early Christian religion and literature. This did not take place because Introduction, in spite of its use of critical method, its questioning of traditional data, and its abandonment, or transformation, or arbitrary attribution, of inspiration, has always remained a theological discipline.

This is not to say that the predominance and the character of these introductory studies led to complete neglect of the study of the New Testament writings as sources of Christian history. For the history of Jesus we have seen what a crop of theories sprang up concerning the Synoptics. Nevertheless this kind of study of the sources, too, shows a tendency to become an end in itself. The Synoptic problem became, as it were, a separate province within the larger province of Introduction. It was assumed that the whole problem was one of reconstruct-

ing the literary factors that had contributed to the formation of the Synoptics — of discovering one or more primitive gospels; while beyond this lay the task of determining the significance and historical value of single pericopes and of their various groupings. This latter concrete and specialized historical analysis — which is after all the kind that counts — tended in fact to confine itself to certain topics — the infancy narratives, the baptism, the resurrection. It was not clearly seen, and is not generally recognized even to-day, that by reason of the specific character of the gospel tradition the chronological and literary arrangement of the sources is of less use in determining the historical value of the data than is the case with ordinary historical traditions, although mere chronological and literary investigation falls, even in these, far short of the ultimate aims of historical criticism.

Therefore, after these earlier studies in Introduction and these theories about the Synoptic problem, a detailed and comprehensive historical analysis of the texts was needed, and a determination of the general character of the gospel tradition, and finally, as a consequence of these two, a reconstruction of the history of Christian origins. The history of the gospel tradition had to be taken up into this general reconstruction, and the results of such a process were in their turn capable of confirming the soundness of the reconstruction itself.

To the first and second of these tasks David Friedrich Strauss (1808–1874) made a contribution of prime importance in his “*Leben Jesu*,” issued in a first edition in 1835.³⁸ Strauss paid no attention to the Synoptic problem, that is, to the general relations of the literary sources, and for reasons suggested above this neglect was at the time of advantage; but the work of earlier scholars in analysis and exegesis he appropriated completely and admirably. Before the appearance of Strauss’s *Leben Jesu*, the *Handbuch* of Paulus constituted a veritable storehouse of materials; now Strauss’s book absorbed the

³⁸ *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*, 2 vols. (1835, 1836). In reality, the second volume also was issued in 1835. The third edition (1838, 1839) was somewhat modified in favor of traditional views as to the value and use of the Fourth Gospel; but the fourth edition (1840) returned to the position of the first.

Handbuch, which it followed step by step, using it, criticizing it, and improving upon it. The results of Strauss's work may be summed up as follows:

(1) He undertook to determine the historical value of the separate pericopes in the gospels. Of course these required further elaborate discussion case by case, but Strauss furnished the elements, critically worked out, for such subsequent study.

(2) He established definitively the antithesis between the Synoptic gospels and the Fourth Gospel, and the necessity, for the reconstruction of the history, of choosing between the two traditions. Here too it is not to be understood that Strauss solved completely and for all time the historical and literary problem of the Fourth Gospel, but he determined the principle of what its value is as an historical source.

(3) He applied systematically the conception of 'myth' to the gospel tradition. 'Myth,' with Strauss, must not be understood to mean the fabrication out of nothing of a story that did not exist before. He never treated as doubtful the historic reality of Jesus and of the main events of his earthly career. By 'myth' he meant a working over and reshaping of the actual facts into an ideal form, which took place in the minds of the first Christians especially under the influence of Old Testament models and of the idea of the Messiah found in Daniel. Here too we may question the specific applications that Strauss made of the concept of myth, and the almost exclusively Old Testament origin which he ascribed to it, as well as his conception of the process of the formation of the myth; but a real and substantial advance was made with the conception of an ideal transfiguration of the story of Jesus through the medium of Christian minds and in accordance with religious parallels which had existed prior to the preaching of Jesus or at any rate are not chiefly derived from his teaching.

These were great achievements, even though they still had a preparatory and negative character. But is there in Strauss's book, over and above these things, a positive reconstruction of the figure and the epoch of Jesus? There is, although its several features are scattered, being hidden and almost choked by the mass of his critical and polemic analysis. Jesus nourished his

own spirit by reading and pondering over the Old Testament, especially the prophets, the Psalms, and Daniel. The belief of the pharisees in angels and in the resurrection, and the conception, implicit in that belief, of a religious development subsequent to Moses, offered points of support for the formation of Jesus' religion. Contacts of Jesus with essenism, which contained the germ of gnostic tendencies,³⁹ cannot have been lacking, although they were chiefly external and occasional.⁴⁰ It is not impossible also that in Jerusalem he had relations with hellenistic Jews and with 'god-fearing' pagans which helped to enlarge his vision and spiritualize his ideas. But the principal element in the formation of his religious character was always the depth of his own spiritual personality. He was attracted by the preaching of John the Baptist, who was a nazirite ascetic and perhaps also had connection with the essenes, for their lustrations were somewhat like his baptism, the significance of which in any case was messianic. In following the Baptist, Jesus became familiar with the messianic idea, but his spiritual development went on independently, and he abandoned the ritualistic and ascetic practices of John. Then, when John was thrown into prison, he began to preach on his own account and in his own manner. His messianic self-consciousness must have come into being gradually, and chiefly under the influence of Isaiah and Daniel; the kingdom of God was to him distinctly transcendental, that is, it consisted in a radical transformation brought about unexpectedly and by divine intervention, but he did not conceive it as idealistic in the modern sense, although it represented a spiritualization of current ideas. In the end he identified himself with the Son of Man of Daniel, destined to come with the clouds of heaven.⁴¹ Whether he had a belief in his own pre-existence is uncertain. While he may at the beginning have conceived of his own messianic exaltation as to be achieved otherwise than through death,

³⁹ Strauss admits a possible connection between the ebionite gnosticism and essenism.

⁴⁰ Strauss finds a possible essene influence on Jesus in his attitude toward riches and perhaps in the joining of the care of the body with that of the soul.

⁴¹ Strauss holds that even the apocalypse of the Synoptics corresponds to the actual ideas of Jesus.

he must afterwards have seen more and more clearly that death was the inevitable path to exaltation.

It may be doubted whether many readers have a clear idea of all these positive elements in the work of Strauss, and especially of the picture as a whole. But the picture is worth more — many times more — than any number of lives of Jesus of the nineteenth century and its character is less revolutionary than has been conventionally assumed. It is to be noted especially that Strauss, while denying the literal exactness of the prophecies of the passion and the resurrection ascribed to Jesus by the gospels, admits that Jesus had a presentiment of his death and — what is more — an idea of its providential significance; and he does not deny that Jesus may even have believed in his own pre-existence. His interpretation of the messiahship of Jesus is also well balanced. It gives equal weight to the influence of the Old Testament and John the Baptist and to the original thought of Jesus himself. It defines very successfully the double character of the kingdom of God as transcendental and realistic at the same time (a combination which many have failed to perceive, even though it is clearly suggested by the written word and by the known facts); and finally the coëxistence, not external but inherent in such a conception, of Jewish and universal elements is also at least suggested by Strauss.

The defects of his reconstruction, apart from those of formal exposition already alluded to, lie not so much in what it contains as in what it omits. With the Old Testament the Apocryphal literature, both apocalyptic and other, does not receive due attention, and in general the whole religious situation among the Jews is not investigated and illumined as it ought to have been. The hellenistic pagan environment also is almost entirely neglected and its influence on the development and transformation of the Christian tradition, in contrast to the treatment of the Old Testament and of Judaism, is almost completely ignored. There is no characterization and comprehensive estimate of the ethics of Jesus or of his relation to eschatology. The question of a mysterious or mystical element in the preaching and ministry of Jesus is not taken up.

More generally, we may say that the portrait of Jesus and of

the movement which he led is not clearly drawn by Strauss as a religious and historical reality;⁴² and finally, since he undertook to write a life of Jesus and at the same time incorporated in it his criticism of the gospel tradition, the result is incongruous, in that the later development is continually presupposed and utilized, although it is nowhere deliberately discussed. This incongruity, indeed, Strauss has in common with many others; it owes its origin to the type of Life of Jesus based on literary criticism and separating matters that cannot be understood separately. The true Life of Jesus begins with the resurrection. It is only by first eliciting the history of primitive Christianity that we can hope to get back, by a process of inference, to the correct picture of the historical Jesus.

§ 4. THE PERIOD OF THE TÜBINGEN SCHOOL

The effect of Strauss's Life of Jesus might be summed up, with but little exaggeration, in the antithesis: complete opposition in word, complete acceptance in fact. Acceptance, that is to say, not of its conclusions but of its point of view and method. Gradually and quietly, but surely and in the end completely, Strauss's work penetrated the criticism of the New Testament.

The first critic, indeed, to be mentioned from the immediately succeeding years, Christian Hermann Weisse (1801-1866), in his work "*Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philologisch bearbeitet*" (1838),⁴³ refers to Strauss's *Leben Jesu* with full recognition of its value. He accepts the principle of the 'myth' as laid down by Strauss, although with criticism of the latter's specific applications of it, and is in accord with Strauss in excluding the Fourth Gospel from the reconstruction of the life of Jesus, although he tries to save its claim to a partly apostolic origin. But he completes the work of Strauss by bringing into the foreground the interrelationship of the gospel narratives, of which Strauss, in his analyses of separate peri-

⁴² Notice especially his disparagement of the title Son of Man, which he calls "a mere secondary character" in Daniel, which "according to the Jewish taste" became a fixed designation (4th ed., § 61, p. 493). Also his explanations of the 'messianic secret' (§ 62, p. 502) are somewhat superficial.

⁴³ He published later *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium* (1856).

copes, had lost sight. This common historical element, once recovered, would form a test to distinguish the historical from the unhistorical parts, and so make possible the reconstruction of the life of Jesus. Following this path, Weisse was led to the intensive study of the Synoptic problem, which Strauss, accepting Griesbach's theory of Mark as the epitomator of Matthew and Luke, had neglected. Weisse reached the opposite conclusion from Griesbach, and may be called the true founder of the theory of the priority of Mark.⁴⁴ To his mind the chief argument lay in the order and composition of the narrative,⁴⁵ which seemed to him more primitive in Mark. By a curious coincidence, in the same year 1838 the same theory of the priority of Mark was maintained by Christian Gottlob Wilke (1786-1854)⁴⁶ in a minute analytical study of the Synoptic question.

Partly through the character of Weisse's own mind (for like Strauss he had first been a student of philosophy) and partly through the influence of Strauss, Weisse was led beyond philosophical investigation as an end in itself. Guided by the historical interest that had originally directed his attention to the Synoptic problem, he passed from the demonstration of the primitive character of Mark to an historical reconstruction on that basis; yet he did not accept Mark *en bloc*, without criticism, but deemed only the large outlines to be definitely fixed.

The baptism of Jesus, he held, marked a decisive experience, which manifested itself as a vision. Yet Jesus' own messianic consciousness went through a process of maturing, passing from the ordinary conception of the Messiah to the spiritual conception, which he later vaguely indicated, but without apocalyptic significance, in the title Son of Man. There was no period of diminishing success after the first popular favor. The people's favor always accompanied him. Nor did any external occur-

⁴⁴ We should remember that this thesis had been maintained as early as 1782 by Kopp, in 1794 by Storr, and again in 1831 by Knobel, as well as by Lachmann, on whom see the next note.

⁴⁵ Three years before, Lachmann (*De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis synopticis*) had emphasized the importance of the "*ordo narrationum evangelicarum*" and had shown how this points to the priority of Mark.

⁴⁶ *Der Urevangelist oder eine exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung des Verwandschaftsverhältnisses der drei ersten Evangelien.*

rences engender in his mind the idea of his own death as necessary and providential.⁴⁷ It was by reason of an inner conviction of a higher necessity that he challenged death by going to Jerusalem. Up to that moment he had kept away from the Holy City partly in order that he might not be forced to declare his messiahship publicly, partly from his indifference toward forms of worship and from his superiority to the current legalistic and strictly nationalistic ideas. He foresaw, and foretold to the disciples, that his work would continue and would come to victory after his death. The resurrection is a spiritual fact which assumed a concrete form in the visions of his followers.

If we compare the Jesus of Weisse with the Jesus of Strauss, we see that the former is more clearly outlined, and is given a more definite religious personality. In the journey to Jerusalem, as interpreted by Weisse, there is bold resolution and an exalted sense of mystery. The conception of the resurrection is well knit. But the rejection of the apocalyptic element is arbitrary, and the complete separation of Jesus from his environment is inconsistent with history. We find realized in Weisse, at the expense of history, the ideal already put forward by Eichhorn,⁴⁸ of making the criticism of the sources of the gospels serve the purpose of that "simplification of Christian doctrine over which for fifty years German theology [had] labored so zealously." In Weisse's presentation the Gospel of Mark was made to lend itself to what was in fact an arbitrary and unhistorical idealization of the gospel story.

But before this new phase of the Synoptic question and of the investigation of the life of Jesus was fully developed, the Tübingen school — in which besides the leader, Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792–1860),⁴⁹ we should mention especially Friedrich

⁴⁷ At the utmost Weisse admits that Jesus may have felt a lessening of his own power to work prodigies. At Jerusalem he did not accomplish any miracles.

⁴⁸ *Einleitung*, 2nd ed., I, p. 445.

⁴⁹ Baur first set forth his conception in a series of separate studies: 'Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde' (1831; and a later article on the same subject, 1836); *Der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche*; *Der Apostel Paulus in Rom* (1831); *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des*

Schwegler (1819–1857)⁵⁰ — performed for the apostolic period of Christian origins a service analogous to what Strauss had done for the history of Jesus. In examining the Acts of the Apostles and comparing its narrative with what is found in the epistles of Paul, Baur became convinced that the two traditions are irreconcilable, just as Strauss had found the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions irreconcilable, and he elaborated a critical analysis of the narratives of Acts which was in a great measure destructive, as had been Strauss's analysis of the narratives of the gospels. But Baur differed from Strauss in that through his criticism he worked out a systematic reconstruction of this apostolic period, in which his criticism was incorporated with that reciprocal relation that is characteristic of true history. The basis of his reconstruction, as everyone knows, was the conflict between the Petrine and Pauline conceptions of Christianity, between the Christianity of Jewish believers and Christian universalism. The two, he held, were later brought together in the Catholic church, in the course of the second century. The documents and products of the two rival tendencies and of their reconciliation were the several canonical writings of the New Testament. Most of these he assigned to late dates and declared to be non-apostolic pseudepigrapha. This part of the construction was developed particularly by Schwegler, who surpassed Baur himself in carrying out the system to its ultimate consequences, and who attempted to reconstruct the history, not merely of the apostolic, but even of the post-apostolic age, for which he employed the same supposedly apostolic writings of the canon, that is, all the New Testament except the four chief epistles of Paul and the Book of Revelation.

The special greatness of the Tübingen school lay in its deliberate and powerful effort to fuse into a single whole the history,

Apostels Paulus untersucht (1835); etc. It is fully developed in his *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi: sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre: ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums* (1845; 2nd ed., 1866–67), and in his *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (1853; 3rd ed., 1863). To be considered also are the *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien* (1847) and the posthumous *Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie* (1864; 2nd ed., 1892).

⁵⁰ *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (1846).

doctrine, and literature of the earliest period of Christianity. 'Introduction to the New Testament' and 'Theology of the New Testament' ceased to be independent, self-sufficient disciplines and theological entities, and were absorbed into the living unity and organic development of the history of Christianity. The historical point of view and the demands of history were affirmed with an uncompromising finality hitherto unknown⁵¹ and not destined to be repeated. The dogmatic barrier encircling the life and teaching of Jesus was broken; the creative importance of the apostolic and post-apostolic periods was recognized. The elaboration of the gospel tradition was no longer explained, as it had been by Strauss, by assuming an almost mechanical imposition of Old Testament forms and ideas, but by studying the living mind and heart of Christianity, which generated from its own bosom problems, contrasts, and solutions. Hegel's philosophy of history was bearing fruit in the realm of theology.⁵²

On the other hand, the defects of the Tübingen school were also great. Their reconstruction concentrated the entire historical development of primitive Christianity in the Apostle Paul and the conflict regarding the law. They did not trace a line of development from Jesus to the church at Jerusalem, thence to the church of Antioch, and so to Paul. Baur, it is true, recognized the presence of a hellenistic group in the church at Jerusalem, and he considered Stephen to have been the precursor of Paul, but he failed to deduce the consequences of these correctly perceived facts. Thus Jesus on the one hand and Paul on the other appear as isolated figures — isolated and idealized out of their concrete, historical background, except so far as Paul is represented as occupied with the conflict over the law. As to the teaching of Jesus, Baur held that it con-

⁵¹ For the theoretical formulation of Baur's principles, see the prefaces to the 1st and 2nd editions of *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, and the monograph, *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung* (1852).

⁵² Mention should be made of Baur's studies in philosophical and religious history: *Symbolik und Mythologie* (1824-25); *Das Manichäische Religionssystem* (1831); *Die christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie* (1835); *Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie* (published together in the posthumous edition of 1876).

stituted a religion and not a theology,⁵³ that is, it contained an essential primitive element which is defined as "the ideal unification and fusion of all the conflicting ideas and tendencies which were present in the consciousness of the times."⁵⁴ No wonder then that Baur made little account of John the Baptist and his movement,⁵⁵ herein differing from Strauss; that to the kingdom of God he gave a purely spiritual interpretation; that to him the Son of Man, that specifically apocalyptic and mystic name, signified only Jesus' emphasis on the human element in the idea of the Messiah, in contrast to the theocratic Son of God of Judaism. By this contrast Baur explained also the 'messianic secret'; the journey to Jerusalem was Jesus' attempt to force the Jews to accept or reject his idea of the Messiah; and the problem of Jesus' expectation of his death was solved by reducing it to a mere 'presentiment' of a violent end, by which all the dogmatic implications of the passion were evaded and ignored.⁵⁶ The Apostle Paul is presented to us as carrying on and perfecting the spiritual religion of Jesus solely by the means of his personal experience, and as the true founder of the absoluteness of Christianity. His theology and his sacramentalism are spiritualized, although a realistic element creeps in when Paul's conception of the Spirit is described as the idea of a 'luminous substance' (but, Baur adds, a 'spiritual' substance), and his conception of Christ as that of a 'luminous' (but here also 'spiritual') figure, the "prototype of man";⁵⁷ the christology of Paul Baur relegates to the class of secondary questions;⁵⁸ his rejection of the law is treated as a mere psychological, dialectic result of his conversion before Damascus,

⁵³ *Vorlesungen über die neutestamentliche Theologie* (new edition), pp. 73-74.

⁵⁴ *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (3rd ed., 1863), p. 27.

⁵⁵ In *Paulus*, part I, chapter VII (2nd ed., pp. 208 ff.), the episode of the disciples of John in Acts 19 (one of the very few documents that show the real complexity of early Christian history) is interpreted by Baur as a creation of the tendency to make Paul appear (in parallelism to Peter) as conferring the gifts of the Spirit on a special class of Christians.

⁵⁶ For the ideas of Baur on Jesus, see the first edition of *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, and that of *Vorlesungen über die neutestamentliche Theologie*.

⁵⁷ *Paulus*, part III, chapter VIII (2nd ed., pp. 631-632).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

and its connection with Paul's mystical and gnostic theology is ignored.⁵⁹ And as Paul's rejection of the law is not included in the picture of his doctrine, so the historical and religious background, both Jewish and gentile, upon which Paul and Jesus really rested, is also ignored, or at least treated incompletely and superficially, in spite of a few felicitous statements of a general and preliminary character.⁶⁰ The criticism of the sources also shows defects: the explanation of Mark as epitomator of Matthew and Luke; hypercriticism respecting the authenticity and antiquity of the New Testament writings; one-sidedness and radicalism combined in the stubborn determination to find everywhere the conflict over the law and to unlock every door by that pass-key. The final result was an exclusive, abstract, schematic view, which concealed, or at least colored, the living complexity of the origins of Christianity.

Contemporary with Baur and of almost the same surname, Bruno Bauer (1809–1882),⁶¹ a rebel theologian, whom no faculty of divinity was willing to receive into its bosom, carried Strauss's radical criticism to extremes, substituting for the concept of myth that of conscious invention on the part of the New Testament writers. This literary invention was, however, the expression of the experience of the Christian church. Bauer began by applying his theory to the Fourth Gospel,⁶² where his task was easy. But he soon passed to the Synoptics,⁶³ accepting from Weisse and Wilke the priority of Mark, but using this gospel not, like Weisse, in order to lay a firm foundation for the gospel history, but to support the conclusion that

⁵⁹ On Paul, see, besides the monograph *Paulus*, also the second section of Baur's work on the first three centuries and the second section of his *Vorlesungen über die neutestamentliche Theologie*.

⁶⁰ *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (3rd ed., p. 5); Christianity is "a general form of the religious consciousness corresponding to the spirit of the time and prepared for by the whole previous historical evolution of the nations." (In the phrase "general form" we see the abstract philosophical concept.) There follow several pages devoted chiefly to Greek philosophy, Jewish monotheism, and essenism. Hellenistic religions and Jewish apocalyptic are ignored.

⁶¹ On Bruno Bauer see Schweitzer, chapter XI.

⁶² *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes* (1840).

⁶³ *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, 3 volumes (1841–1842).

even the Synoptic tradition, in its earliest extant form, may have been the literary creation of a single writer. This conclusion rested on a hypercritical analysis of Mark's narrative. Bauer admitted the historical personality of Jesus, and that he had exercised an influence on a circle of followers, but Jesus the Messiah ⁶⁴ he banished from history, and with him the baptism, the temptation, sermons, parables, and miracles. Then, extending his criticism to Acts and the epistles of Paul, ⁶⁵ he put them all on one level, and ended by declaring that both Acts and epistles were also a "free product of reflection, a late creation." At this point, realizing that the last support of the historical existence of Jesus was demolished, Bauer decided against that too. ⁶⁶ But with Jesus the Christian community of the first century disappeared also, and Bauer entered upon a new reconstruction, not to be completed for a quarter of a century, by which he explained the origin of Christianity as having taken place in the midst of the Graeco-Roman world. ⁶⁷ Once more the fixed idea of this writer, now definitely become a writer of fiction, made a literary personality, that of Seneca, the point of departure. Not, however, that Seneca had directly created Christianity; he had been but the representative and promoter of spiritual currents which, coalescing with a Jewish stream of ideas (prepared for by Philo and expressed by Flavius Josephus), gave rise to Christianity at about the time of Trajan, and produced as a literary creation the imaginary personality of Jesus. Bauer's critical views had no influence, and his denial of the existence of Jesus, with the consequent sociological-literary creation of Christianity, remained for the time isolated and forgotten.

⁶⁴ In his criticism of the 'messianic secret' Bauer anticipates Wrede.

⁶⁵ *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1850); *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe* (1850-52; in three parts).

⁶⁶ In his *Kritik der Evangelien und Geschichte ihres Ursprungs*, in four volumes (1851-52), which combines the two previous works on John and the Synoptics, reproducing them almost word for word. It is in fact called a "second edition."

⁶⁷ *Christus und die Cäsaren: der Ursprung des Christenthums aus dem römischen Griechenthum* (1877). This was preceded by the essay, *Philo, Strauss, und Renan und das Urchristenthum* (1874).

§ 5. GERMAN LIBERALISM; RENAN

The death of Baur (1860) almost coincided with the definitive formulation of the 'theory of two sources' of the Synoptic gospels. This theory, though primarily a matter of literary criticism, contributed directly to the historical reconstruction, and the nature of the reconstruction was a reaction both against Strauss and against the Tübingen school.

The theory of two sources was foreshadowed, so far as the second source is concerned, by Schleiermacher, who maintained that the work of Matthew referred to by Papias was a collection of discourses, not our First Gospel,⁶⁸ while on the side of Mark it had been outlined by Weisse,⁶⁹ who put the second source on a level with Mark. But it owed its classic formulation to Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (1832-1910), in his "Die Synoptischen Evangelien" of 1863. In the introduction to this book Holtzmann declared himself definitely opposed both to Strauss and to the Tübingen view, although he recognized in the latter a measure of truth which made it incomparably superior to the former. His starting point is the criticism of the sources, to which Strauss, who considered it already completed, had paid little attention. As the result of this criticism, Holtzmann was decided in affirming the historical character of the Synoptic gospels; he reduced their 'tendenciality' to very modest limits, and restored the early date of their compilation. Source A, the Proto-Mark,⁷⁰ preserved the oldest records of the disciples in their original form. The second source, L (Logia), went back to the oral testimony of an apostle or of apostles, and was fully trustworthy. Matthew, although belonging to the Jewish-Christian circle, is not unduly favorable to Judaism. In Mark no partisan tendency is clearly discoverable. Luke has a certain Pauline character, but its so-called ebionite elements demonstrate the objectivity of the historian and the absence of an

⁶⁸ 'Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias über unsere Evangelien' in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1832).

⁶⁹ *Die evangelische Geschichte*. See above, pp. 290-292.

⁷⁰ Holtzmann considered our Mark a shortened form of A, the discourses found in A being omitted.

acute conflict of tendencies, such as the Tübingen scholars imagined. The dates of the two sources and the three Synoptics are set between the years 60 and 80. In the thirty years that elapsed between the events and Source A, no complete reversal of history or creation of myths can have taken place.⁷¹ The Fourth Gospel is definitely separated from the Synoptics by Holtzmann, who says that he has reconstructed the figure of the Synoptic Christ independently of that of the Johannine Christ in order to make possible a "fruitful comparison" (p. 9). This comparison, however, was never made, and in liberal German theology from that time on the Fourth Gospel was eliminated as an historical source. On this point, in fact, Holtzmann accepted the position of Strauss and Baur.

With this basis Holtzmann undertook the historical reconstruction of the person and career of Jesus,⁷² and his picture of Jesus proved to be very different from that of Strauss and much more like that of Baur. The messiahship of Jesus was moral, and not theocratic; the fundamental idea was the fatherhood of God, with Jesus as sole intermediary between God and humanity (the reason for this exclusiveness not being given); the term Son of Man was interpreted in accord with Baur as having a moral significance, and as standing in the mind of Jesus in complementary antithesis to the Son of God. But this moral ideal was also affected in Jesus' mind by his expectation of the imminent coming of the kingdom of God, with its national connotations.

Holtzmann's reconstruction of the career of Jesus, which, no less than his theory of the two sources, has become classic, was as follows. The baptism marked a decisive moment in the consciousness of Jesus, who in consequence was irresistibly led to public activity. His ministry was attended with ever increasing success, in which Holtzmann thought he could distinguish seven widening circles until in the midst of the last of these Jesus abandoned his public ministry. This was the moment of the confession of Peter and the definite announcement

⁷¹ On this subject see Holtzmann, chapter V, 'Die synoptischen Evangelien als Geschichtsquellen.'

⁷² Chapter V, § 29, 'Lebensbild Jesu nach der Quelle A.'

of Jesus' messiahship in the intimate circle of his disciples. Jesus then saw, "with ever increasing clearness," the necessity of his tragic end, the only end worthy of him who refused to accept the popular political conception of the Messiah and disdained to raise the masses in his own favor against the hostility of the upper social classes. In this spirit he went to Jerusalem to meet his death.

In all this there was less of the language of philosophy, less 'Absolutheit,' than in Baur, and more of historical concreteness, at least in appearance and intention, in portraying the various phases of the life of Jesus. But there was also the usual spiritualizing of Jesus and a tendency to treat as accidental and secondary whatever in his mind and in his effective work reflected the ideas and sentiments of the time. With this tendency went also the use of a rather literary and sentimental phraseology (in place of Baur's philosophical terms), which slightly clouded the real problems of history.

In the section entitled 'Lebensbild Jesu nach der Quelle A' Holtzmann borrowed largely and with due appreciation, both by direct quotation and in summaries, from an inaugural address of Theodor Keim (1825-1878), "Die menschliche Entwicklung Jesu" (1860; published in 1861), in which the fundamental aim was "to approach the human development of Jesus with all seriousness and to follow in his life, with the utmost exactness, an historical and psychological conception," while at the same time preserving intact faith in Jesus as a superhuman being "in the bosom of the living God, his Father." Keim developed these ideas further in a large "Geschichte Jesu von Nazara" in three volumes,⁷³ containing a full criticism of the sources, numerous exegetical and theological discussions, and a great amount of material (rather amassed than selected or fully utilized) illustrating the places and times of the gospel story. Although Keim agreed with Holtzmann in making the Synoptics the historical foundation of his work, he held to the belief (and for this was reproved by Holtzmann) in the priority and superiority of Matthew over Mark. Perhaps it was due to this

⁷³ Geschichte Jesu von Nazara in ihrer Verkettung mit dem Gesamtleben seines Volkes frei untersucht und ausführlich erzählt (1867-1872).

fact, as Schweitzer observes, that he recognized much more fully than Holtzmann the eschatological and realistic element in the preaching of Jesus and in Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God. In the Galilean ministry Keim distinguished a first period of success and a second of comparative failure, and with this external change he connected an internal development in Jesus himself, in which, however, he recognized three stages instead of two. At first Jesus thought of the kingdom as future; then, under the impression of his success, it appeared to him as a present reality in course of development; lastly, in the period of failure, the purely eschatological aspect of it became again uppermost. The end of Keim's work is a pure psychological fantasy, more complicated and with less verisimilitude than Renan's "Life of Jesus."

In these same years Strauss the destroyer was himself seized with the desire to reconstruct, and he published his new "Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk,"⁷⁴ in which he intended to give the positive results of the analysis of the texts. His critical position regarding the sources (exclusion of the Fourth Gospel and priority of Matthew), the miracles, and the gospel myths remained unchanged; but the figure of Jesus as now delineated was notably different from that of 1835. It was substantially the same as that of Holtzmann, that is to say, more spiritualistic and less eschatological than that of Keim. Its main features are Jesus' faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man (§ 34), his power of retiring into himself and there finding happiness, his peace with God and with himself (§ 37). Even the messianic bliss is for Jesus properly a "spiritual and moral elevation," a "filial relation to God," although this inner bliss, "already desirable for itself, contains at the same time the germ of every external betterment" (§ 37). The author still holds firmly that Jesus believed in a miraculous transformation of the world and in his own coming on the clouds of heaven as judge (§ 39), but at the same time affirms that Jesus wished to found "something that would endure" (§ 43), that in case he should succeed at Jerusalem, he must have had ready a plan of

⁷⁴ Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet (1864; later in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vols. III and IV).

reform and of the religious reorganization of the people (§ 44). Jesus wished to reform Judaism by disseminating "circumspectly" the idea that the Mosaic law did not correspond to the true essence of religion (§ 36). In accordance with this new conception Strauss emphasized the relation between Jesus and essenism. The links between Judaism and Jesus were the essenes and John the Baptist, himself a pure essene, even though he lived as a solitary. Jesus absorbed the true and vital element of essenism, leaving out "alles Beengendes und Beschränkendes" (§ 30).

If we compare these three 'Jesusbilder' of Holtzmann, Keim, and Strauss, in both their resemblances and diversities, with the resemblances and diversities of the three authors regarding the sources of the gospels, we see that the criticism of the sources did not have as much influence on the historical reconstruction of Jesus as we should have expected. This impression is strengthened if we extend the comparison to the *Lives of Jesus* by Karl Hase (1800–1890)⁷⁵ and Willibald Beyschlag (1823–1900).⁷⁶ Both of these writers differ from the three preceding in accepting much of the Fourth Gospel as historical material, even, be it noted, for the ideas of Jesus. This is evidently a fundamental difference of critical method, but it makes less difference in the history. Hase, who is more occupied with describing earlier researches than with developing his own ideas, considers the messianic idea "the fixed central point" of the life and death of Jesus, but by this he means not the popular idea of the Messiah — on the contrary, "his whole purpose was to bring about a moral revolution, and to found the kingdom of God in the hearts of men." Thus the title Son of Man had the meaning that Baur gave it, of an ideal humanity. Hase admits that at a certain stage of Jesus' plan the theocratic earthly form of the messianic hope had its place, but only, as with Strauss in his second *Leben Jesu*, as a result of the moral

⁷⁵ *Geschichte Jesu nach akademischen Vorlesungen* (1876; 2nd ed., 1891). This took the place of the same author's *Leben Jesu*, published from 1829 to 1865.

⁷⁶ *Das Leben Jesu: erster, untersuchender Teil* (1885); *zweiter, darstellender Teil* (1886).

and religious revolution for which he strove. Even so, in the end Jesus renounced this, when faced with the facts of experience, and asked for this earthly realization only if it were the will of the Father (§§ 58-59). Thus the scheme of two periods, first success then failure, was applied to the ideas of Jesus; from the experience of failure, as in Holtzmann's view, arose the idea of a providential death (§ 80).

In Beyschlag the same religious and moral motives appear, with special emphasis on the absolute certainty in the mind of Jesus of his spiritual relation of sonship to God. There is the same early hope in Jesus of the acceptance of him by the people as Messiah; as to eschatology, the three stages of Keim (instead of the two of Hase), namely, eschatological expectation, the hope of present and progressive realization, and finally, with the failure of this hope, the eschatological idea again dominant.

If we add to the comparison the "Leben Jesu" of Bernhard Weiss (1827-1918),⁷⁷ greatest of the conservative German theologians, we shall find, as Schweitzer remarks with justice, that in the end Weiss, in spite of his differing theological position, treats Jesus' public career and the gradual development of the messianic consciousness in substantially the same way as the other authors mentioned; and we may conclude that between 1860 and 1890, notwithstanding the differences in views of literary criticism and in theological opinions, the representation of the internal and external history of Jesus which grew up in Germany was remarkably uniform. The infancy narratives were admitted or not, but in either case they were dissociated from the development of the personality of Jesus; the 'experience of baptism' was a decisive experience for him; in the messianic consciousness of Jesus, which is admitted to have developed gradually, the concepts Son of God and Son of Man were understood spiritually, and subordinated to that of the fatherhood of God; in the concept of the kingdom of God there was a Jewish, material outer shell, but a moral, spiritual kernel which was peculiar to Jesus; his preaching ministry passed through a stage of success and one of failure (in so far as the

⁷⁷ *Das Leben Jesu*, 2 vols. (1882; 4th ed., revised, 1902).

people did not accept his spiritual idea of the Messiah); through this experience Jesus foresaw his tragic end and conceived the idea of his providential death; his conscious purpose in going to Jerusalem was to face death, leaving the future realization of the kingdom to the will of the Father. This was a reconstruction eminently psychological and individualistic. In substance the development in the personal consciousness of Jesus was interpreted according to a modernizing idealism. We find here no picture of the religious ideas and sentiments of the time, no realization of the religious and social character of the movement of Jesus, no account of the environment from which that sprang and in which it developed. Abstract conceptions and records of facts alike were used with the ultimate purpose, not of understanding their significance for the contemporaries of Jesus, but of gaining from them something of value for ourselves.

The same tendency is present in the "Dogmengeschichte" of Adolf von Harnack, in the first volume of which, written in 1885,⁷⁸ it appears not only in the treatment of Jesus but also in the discussion of primitive Christianity and the Apostle Paul. Harnack raises the idealistic interpretation of Jesus to its greatest height, making the revelation of the fatherhood of God the central point of the gospel and assuming that in the mind of Jesus the idea of his divine sonship, originating in his faith in the divine fatherhood, preceded the idea of his messiahship, which had sprung from his own consciousness of God and from the work he accomplished through the grace of God.⁷⁹ The purely internal development of the messianic consciousness of Jesus was also emphasized by Harnack in his refusal to assign any value to the 'experience of the baptism' and to the 'messianic secret.' His sole concessions to the eschatological interpretation were the admission of a certain dualism in the thought of Jesus, by which the kingdom of God was at one and

⁷⁸ *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, I. Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas. In the preface to the fourth edition (1909), which we have at hand, it is said that no substantial alterations have been made from the first edition.

⁷⁹ These ideas were further emphasized in the famous little book, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1900; sixtieth thousand, 1908).

the same time present and visible, and future and invisible, and the conception of Jesus as 'messias designatus,' not the actual but the future Messiah.

For primitive Christianity and Paul, Harnack's work — or rather the introduction entitled 'Die Voraussetzungen der Dogmengeschichte' ⁸⁰ — is the antithesis of Tübingen and the continuation of Ritschl. ⁸¹ Harnack gives full credit to the importance of pre-pauline Christianity, so neglected by the Tübingen school; he rightly restores to this period the beginnings of christological speculations and universalism. But in his brief résumé of Paul's theology both the eschatological and the mystical and gnostic elements ⁸² are practically ignored in comparison with the weight given to the abrogation of the law and to justification.

From Hellenism no decisive influence on Paul is admitted; the discussion of his relation to it is restricted to philosophy, with no reference to hellenistic religion or to the mysteries. The Fourth Gospel is treated in the same way; the idea of the Logos ⁸³ was introduced in the prologue only to be supplanted by that of "the only begotten" in the body of the gospel; the

⁸⁰ Harnack held that the history of Christian dogma begins with the "hellenization" of Christianity in the post-apostolic age; against this idea, see my article in *Il Conciliatore*, 1915, pp. 147 ff.

⁸¹ Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889) had first written *Die Entstehung der katholischen Kirche* (1850) in substantial agreement with the Tübingen school, but in the second edition of the work (1857) he definitely detached himself from them, denying the sharp contrast between Paul and the Apostles which was the basis of Baur's view, and representing the Catholic Church not as a fusion of Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity, but as a developed form of the latter. Ritschl regards the historical study of primitive Christianity as culminating in the theological elaboration of the doctrine of revelation. His classic book on theology is *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*.

⁸² In a note (*Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., I, p. 106) Harnack says that the combination in Paul of a strong sacramental and mystical tendency (thus admitting this tendency) with his doctrine of spirituality and liberty was in his time a natural combination for which it is not necessary to seek particular causes, and that the conceptions, symbols, and sacraments in which this combination took concrete form do not constitute a real problem. Thus he summarily dismisses modern researches into the history of religion, with no use of their results, as if the diffused character of certain spiritual ideas and attitudes were a sufficient reason for treating them as negligible.

⁸³ Harnack denies the Greek character of the Logos. This may be so, but in a sense very different from that which he has in mind.

dualism of John is purely ethical, not metaphysical. Here too, as usual, the mysterious and gnostic element is eliminated. Harnack's whole view of early Christianity is as of something isolated and abstract. Erecting a barrier between apostolic and post-apostolic Christianity, he finds the former to be entirely original, entirely removed from external influences (except possibly those of the Old Testament and Judaism), and to be purely religious, that is, not dogmatic and not philosophical; post-apostolic Christianity he regards as influenced by the Greek spirit, which gave it dogma. This contrast of the two periods implies a conception of dogma which excludes from this the speculations of Paul and John, and a conception of Hellenism which restricts that, as already noted, to the philosophy of the schools, ignoring the fact that the world in which Christianity arose and was disseminated was that not of Greek thought but of hellenistic, or rather hellenistic-oriental, culture and religion. This indifference toward the religious realities of the first period of Christianity causes Jewish apocalyptic to be compressed into a single page, with an expression of regret for the "evil inheritance" which it transmitted to Christianity; hellenistic Judaism is spoken of as a philosophy of religion, of some significance in the later elaboration of the gospel; the Judaistic monotheism of such groups as the Hypsistarians is said to be not worth mentioning; and on "the religious dispositions" of the Graeco-Roman world the author bestows hardly more than the usual generalities about the new religious needs and monotheistic tendencies, the cult of emperors, the associations, and the transformation of philosophy.⁸⁴

By the side of Holtzmann and Harnack we must set Karl Weizsäcker (1822-1899), the successor of Baur at Tübingen

⁸⁴ Harnack's attitude may appear somewhat different in *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (1902; 3rd ed., 1915), where at the outset he recognizes (3rd ed., p. 2) that the christianization of the ancient world signifies "the completion and objectivization of Graeco-oriental syncretism," and in chapter III studies this syncretism, a convergence of Hellenism and orientalism, as a condition essential for the propagation of Christianity. But apart from the fact that he gives only a general characterization of this syncretism, without defining its elements of myth, mystery, and realism, it is to be observed that he is dealing here only with the propagation, not with the formation, of Christianity.

and author of a translation of the New Testament which has taken a place in Germany beside that of Luther. Almost contemporary with the classic work of Holtzmann on the Synoptic gospels is Weizsäcker's "*Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung*" (1864; 2nd edition, 1901), in which, although the theory of the two sources of the Synoptic gospels is upheld, the historical character of the Fourth Gospel is also notably maintained and that gospel itself used for the reconstruction of the life of Jesus. The greatest work of Weizsäcker was his "*Das apostolische Zeitalter*" (1886; 3rd edition, 1902). This starts with the resurrection, denying its physical reality and interpreting the appearances as spiritual experiences of the apostles, and then deals with the theology of the first believers at Jerusalem; their belief in the kingdom of God as both present and future is dwelt upon; that the apostles at Jerusalem ever regarded Christ as a divine being is rejected, but it is admitted that even to the primitive church the death of Jesus must have had a soteric value. In general the theology of the church at Jerusalem was mainly built on the ideas of Jewish scholasticism.

The religious world of Paul is here depicted more fully and more concretely, yet the author's interpretation is still that of theological and juridical intellectualism. The realistic element is lacking, sacramentalism interpreted symbolistically, the new life of which the apostle speaks identified simply with justification, the question of Paul's eschatology not brought up, and nothing is said about the connections of Paul's thought with Judaism, Hellenism, and the mysteries. The following section on the events and controversies of Paul's life is exegetical rather than historical, and in any case it presents only the history of a single personality.

To this group of post-tübingen German scholars we may attach the Italian Alessandro Chiappelli, in whose essay, '*Gesù Cristo e i suoi recenti biografi*' (1891),⁸⁵ the author's own views occupy a larger place than the title would suggest. Chiappelli accepts the theory of two sources and the priority of Mark,

⁸⁵ In the *Nuova Antologia* for April 1 and 16, and May 16, 1901; afterward collected with additional notes in *Nuove pagine sul cristianesimo antico* (1902).

without however entirely abandoning the historical character of John, and he adopts the spiritualistic interpretation of the gospel.⁸⁶ The central element in the religious thought of Jesus is "the new idea of God"; the kingdom of Heaven announced by him is "an invisible and spiritual kingdom" consisting in "the internal renewal of the soul which feels itself united with God"; the ideal of Jesus is directly opposed to "that whole complex of Jewish elements with which it is sometimes involved in the gospel narrative." This mixture of elements occurs also to some extent in the words and even the thoughts of Jesus; and the author admits, in agreement with Keim and Beyschlag, an accentuation of the apocalyptic tone as the final crisis draws near. Characteristic of Chiappelli are his insistence on the connection between the preaching of Jesus and the development of primitive Christianity, and his theory of at least an indirect influence on Jesus from the hellenic spirit and culture that had penetrated into Galilee — an hypothesis preferable to that of Strauss, who admitted the possibility of such an influence at Jerusalem.⁸⁷

Holtzmann⁸⁸ and Harnack⁸⁹ together mark the high point of historical theology in Germany in the field of Christian origins in the forty years from 1860 to 1900. An impressive achievement of criticism was accomplished in these years; it has formed the basis for all subsequent work and still largely preserves its value. Considered as interpretation and reconstruc-

⁸⁶ This was also accepted by Baldassare Labanca (1829-1913) in *Il cristianesimo primitivo* (1886).

⁸⁷ Mention should also be made of Chiappelli's study, *Le idee millenarie dei cristiani nel loro svolgimento storico* (1887; republished in *Nuove pagine*; see note 85) in which he emphasizes the faith in the parousia, found in all early Christianity including Paul.

⁸⁸ After his *Synoptische Evangelien*, a work not large in bulk but for substance and power equal to several volumes, Holtzmann's two principal works are his *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung* (1885; 3rd ed., 1892) and his *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2 vols., 1897; 2nd ed., 1911). The former summarizes admirably a century of criticism; on the latter see below.

⁸⁹ Mention should be made here of Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (3 vols., 1893-1904), and still more of his *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Neue Testament: I. Lukas der Arzt* (1905); *II. Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (1907); *III. Die Apostelgeschichte* (1908). He dates the writings of Luke at about the year 62, and thus would put Mark and the Logia very early.

tion of history, the product cannot be called a real advance over Strauss and Baur (with the others of the Tübingen school), that is, over the greater achievements of the preceding thirty years. At least the advance is essentially negative, correcting errors and exaggerations of the earlier writers without substituting any more definite and convincing view of the history. Indeed, some of the sound historical foundations laid by Strauss (the eschatological character of the ministry of Jesus; the process of transformation of the gospel tradition) and by the Tübingen scholars (the problem of the change from primitive to universal Christianity; the inclusion of the New Testament in the historical development of Christianity) were reduced to mere shadows in the newer idealistic and abstract representation of the religion of Jesus and the religion of Paul.

Contemporary with the imposing movement which may be described as literary criticism in method and liberal Protestantism in spirit, and which is represented by the two great names, Holtzmann and Harnack, is the work of Ernest Renan (1823–1892). His “*Histoire des origines du christianisme*” was published in the years between 1863 and 1883,⁹⁰ and thus began in the same year in which Holtzmann’s *Synoptische Evangelien* appeared and ended two years before the publication of the first volume of Harnack’s *Dogmengeschichte*. Still later, in 1893, was issued the posthumous fifth volume of Renan’s “*Histoire du peuple d’Israël*,” which ends with the personality of Jesus, the point at which the *Origines* had started.

Renan had mastered all the critical work of Strauss and the Tübingen school, but, as he was fully aware, held a detached position, agreeing with neither. Thoroughly familiar as he was with German literary analysis of the gospels, he considered it a mere preparation for the historical reconstruction.⁹¹ He was a born historian, that is he had the gift of bringing persons and events before us as living realities and in their true rela-

⁹⁰ *Vie de Jésus*, 1863 (13th ed., revised, 1867); *Les Apôtres*, 1866; *Saint Paul*, 1869; *L’Antechrist*, 1873; *Les Évangiles*, 1877; *L’Église chrétienne*, 1879; *Marc-Aurèle et la fin du monde antique*, 1882. The *Index général*, in a separate volume, appeared in 1883.

⁹¹ In this connection see especially the first pages of the preface to *L’Antechrist*.

tions. That an historian must interpret and must conjecture was his conviction and his principle of method, which he states again and again in his prefaces. But it would be a great mistake to consider him on this account an imaginative dilettante. His knowledge of the materials was ample and secure; his mode of using them, bold and individual, but in the main without any failure of contact with reality. Indeed his attitude toward the sources was frankly conservative. Mark, he held, the earliest of the evangelists and the most trustworthy for the facts, reproduces with few modifications an account based on the recollections of Peter. Matthew deserves entire confidence for the sayings. In the Fourth Gospel the discourses cannot be considered authentic, but the narrative part rests on an excellent tradition, which goes back to the Apostle John.⁹² Acts and the Gospel of Luke are actually from the hand of Luke, the companion of Paul, and although they may contain a certain amount of legendary and apologetic elaboration, their matter is substantially historical.⁹³ The epistles of Paul, except the Pastorals, are authentic,⁹⁴ as are also the letters of James and Jude, although other persons may have had a hand in compiling them or in translating them into Greek. Revelation is earlier than A.D. 70, and was written by the Apostle John or at least published with his consent and under his name.

Perhaps this conservative attitude, which is only in part confirmed by present-day criticism, corresponded to a secret desire of Renan to exhaust every resource for his reconstruction, in which the personalities of Peter, James, and Barnabas, not to speak of Jesus and Paul, are thrown into such strong relief. His

⁹² In the *Vie de Jésus*, Renan maintains, if not the textual authenticity of the Gospel according to Saint John, at least its origin in the school of the apostle in Asia Minor. In *L'Antechrist* and in *L'Église chrétienne* he accepts the hypothesis of authorship by John the presbyter, although he is represented as the pupil of the apostle.

⁹³ In comparing Acts with Paul's epistles, in the preface to *Les Apôtres*, Renan says that the latter are to be preferred; but he afterwards admits that Paul may have altered the facts somewhat (*Les Apôtres*, pp. 209-210; *Saint Paul*, p. 326). The episodes of the Ethiopian eunuch and the centurion Cornelius are regarded as substantially true history.

⁹⁴ Some doubt is admitted as to Colossians, but this is not maintained at the end. Ephesians is said to be a circular letter composed by Paul's secretaries under his direction.

picture, let us repeat, is not properly to be called imaginary, and the moral, social, and physical atmosphere of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece is vividly painted, with a combination of erudition and personal impressions from his own travels. That wherein the historical reconstruction of Renan excels is distinctly the individual and collective psychology and the physical and social setting. Read, for instance, his pages on the personality of Paul contrasted with that of Peter, on the beauty of the community life of the early believers in Jerusalem, on Antioch, Ephesus, Greece, Corinth, in the time of the first Christian missions.

Renan is not quite so successful with the strictly religious history. His inclination to emphasize moral rather than religious aspects led him to neglect in Jesus, as well as in primitive Christianity, the apocalyptic and mystical elements, which are fundamentals of religion. The latter receive even less attention than the former, and in this the French author is indeed the pupil of Germany. The historical environment of John the Baptist's and Jesus' movements is only the ordinary Jewish world, although the baptist sects of the time and the non-orthodox social tendencies within Judaism are mentioned. The baptism of John is interpreted symbolically. In Jesus the primary and fundamental ideas are the fatherhood of God and the spiritual nature of religion. Spiritual also is Jesus' earliest conception of the kingdom of God, into which only later, after his contact with John, the apocalyptic element was introduced, to become finally, toward the end of his career, the predominant element.⁹⁵ "Un culte pure, une religion sans prêtres et sans pratiques extérieures, reposant toute sur les sentiments du coeur, sur l'imitation de Dieu, sur le rapport immédiat de la conscience avec le Père céleste" (*Vie de Jésus*, pp. 85-86)⁹⁶ — such is the religion of Jesus. If we prune off a little sentimentalism, we find here anticipated by twenty years Harnack's introduction to his *Dogmengeschichte*, and by forty years his

⁹⁵ Renan speaks also — not without some inconsistencies — of the presence in the mind of Jesus at the same time of a social-apocalyptic and a spiritual conception of the kingdom.

⁹⁶ Quoted from an edition earlier than the thirteenth.

Das Wesen des Christentums of 1900. The likeness becomes more striking when we see Renan pointing out (p. 118) that in the consciousness of Jesus the idea of Son of God was primary and that of the Messiah secondary and derived. The ethics of Jesus, derived from the idea of God the Father, had a permanent character even in aim, and thus it was he who laid the foundations of the church, including its organization and rites, the origin of the eucharist being earlier than the last supper. At the same time Renan gives credit to the influence of apocalyptic belief, and brings out clearly the ebionite social element (the social aspect of history was always that to which he was most sensitive), while, using an interpretation derived from deism, he finds in Jesus very evident adaptation to the ideas of the time. In the public ministry of Jesus he distinguishes two periods, like the German theologians of his day, but he is more correct than they in speaking of the second period as marked by growing opposition rather than by failure. The journey to Jerusalem represented a last attempt on the part of Jesus to win a victory over the orthodoxy of the pharisees.

As to the Christianity of the church in Jerusalem, Renan's description of its religious character, and his treatment of it as a bridge between Jesus and the Christianity of Antioch and of Paul, are not so happy as his picture of its social life; what he says of Stephen and the church at Antioch is also unsatisfactory. The chapter at the end of *Les Apôtres*, on conditions in the hellenistic-roman world when the Christian mission began, together with his brief summaries of its philosophy, culture, customs, and religious laws, do not give a satisfactory presentation of the religion of the time; on this it is enough to observe that the diffusion of oriental cults is dismissed in three lines.

This defect is not made good by the observations on special points that occur here and there in Renan's *Saint Paul*. Renan carries his psychological treatment of the conversion and of the whole career of Paul to such an extreme as to neglect many difficulties. If the problem of the law is well illuminated, under the influence of the Tübingen school, the eschatology, culture, and christology of Paul and his churches are scantily

treated. The divergence in religious type between Paul and Apollos is reduced to a matter of personal relations and contrasts. In a word, Renan's aptitude for picturesque narrative and description too much prevails, and more than once leads him to portray rather the external than the inner history of the Christian movement.

Renan did not found a school in France. Independently of Renan and influenced by his own study of German theology, Albert Réville (1829–1906), after various essays on the gospels, on Christian dogma, and on the history of religions, published, when well advanced in years, his "*Jésus de Nazareth*" (1897), in which messianism and apocalyptic were reduced to simple elements of the external environment.⁹⁷ Neither can Loisy and the other contemporary French writers on Jesus and early Christianity be said to derive their ideas from Renan. In Germany, although the *Vie de Jésus* commanded attention, Renan's work as a whole was but little regarded, and remained without influence. Yet German theology, which had taught Renan so much about the analytical method, might well have borrowed from him the taste for historical narrative and the sense of organic reconstruction.

§ 6. STUDIES IN THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

The reader of the preface and introduction to Holtzmann's "*Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*" (1897) will notice that at the end of the nineteenth century a change was taking place in German theological criticism. Holtzmann felt that he must justify himself for writing another 'Theology of the New Testament'; he expressly acknowledged the duty of going on to the literary and religious history of primitive Christianity, of having done with the system of treating the New Testament as an independent and isolated unit, and of using the books of the canon as material for the historical reconstruction of the origins of Christianity. Furthermore, he speaks of a

⁹⁷ His son, Jean Réville (1854–1908), who died only two years after the father, published several studies of the Fourth Gospel (see, especially, *Le quatrième Évangile*, 1901), concluding decisively against its genuineness. He wrote also *Les origines de l'Eucharistie* (1908).

religious history, not only of early Christianity, but of later Judaism, thus recognizing the need of continuity and of a more inclusive method within the framework of history.

However, Holtzmann did not make, nor claim to make, full application of these principles in his work, which he presented explicitly as a work of transition. The first part especially, which deals with the teaching of Jesus, keeps rather to the old manner. The analysis of the contemporary Jewish environment is reduced to the usual elements, taken separately and in contrasted pairs — apocalyptic and Alexandrian philosophy, pharisaism and essenism. The page and a half devoted to John the Baptist is superficial and inconclusive. The moralistic relation between God and man is still made the central motive of the preaching of Jesus. For the kingdom of God, Holtzmann maintains the familiar dual conception of present and future, tracing it back erroneously to the contrast between the ancient prophetic views and the apocalyptic of Judaism, and relating it to the traditional scheme of two periods in the career of Jesus. For the Son of Man, the humanistic and pedagogical interpretation is revived (that is, Jesus must have used it to displace the ordinary conception of a Messiah), and for the other term, Son of God, he gives an arbitrary psychological interpretation, that Jesus used it as a link of connection between the theocratic title of Messiah and his own religious consciousness. That is, Holtzmann keeps to the antithesis, so exaggerated and simplified as to become false, of a Jewish idea of the Messiah, by no means religious (p. 283), and a Christian idea, exclusively religious, which he sets off against each other *en bloc*, concluding that the Jewish element in Jesus' teaching was only external, while the moral and religious kernel of it was developed in closest connection with his personal experiences.

A separate chapter is given to pre-pauline Christianity, and thereby acknowledgment made of its real importance. The beginnings of christology are explained as an almost purely internal development within the mind of the believers at Jerusalem. No sacramental value is attached to their rites of baptism and the eucharist; the hellenistic element represented by Stephen is considered only in its anti-jewish aspect. It is

noticeable that at this point the necessity is felt of a chapter on 'The Gnosis of the New Testament' as a transition to the discussion of Paul, although, after the traditional fashion, the meaning given to gnosis is too exclusively intellectualistic. The discussion of Paul's theology follows rather too closely the method of the old *loci theologici*, and pays too little attention to the element coming from the mysteries. However, great weight is attached to Paul's sacramentalism, and in attributing to his conception of baptism and the eucharist a hellenistic character Holtzmann abandons the usual symbolic interpretation. Moreover, the eschatology of Paul is put in the right light, and while the relation between this and the element connected with the mysteries is understood as simply one of contrast, the one-sidedness of such a view (still widely prevalent) is corrected by the recognition of a hellenistic element in the eschatology. The prominence given to the hellenistic factor in the thought of Paul is the novel and important point in this later work of Holtzmann, although the amount of attention paid to purely internal analysis, at the expense of comparison and synthesis, prevents this germ of truth from producing its full result. The same criticism applies to the succeeding discussion of the theology of John, where the traditional formulas led Holtzmann to an unfortunate separation of the "theologische Hemisphäre" (God, Logos, incarnation, Spirit) from the "soteriologische Hemisphäre" (anthropology, regeneration, faith, sacraments).

In Otto Pfeiderer (1839-1908), a contemporary of Holtzmann and like him a distinguished theologian of the post-tübingen school of criticism, the innovations are still greater and more evenly distributed between Jesus and early Christianity. His principal work, "Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang," showed in the first edition of 1887 substantially the same position that we have characterized as that of Holtzmann and Harnack. In the new edition of 1902 the term kingdom of God as used by Jesus is interpreted simply in the popular eschatological sense, bearing a transcendental character, which is thought of as existing chiefly in the pietistic groups of 'the poor,' who

groaned under the yoke of the legalistic aristocracy, a notable instance of a combined religious and social interpretation of history. The term Son of Man also is at last given its true meaning, the apocalyptic, transcendental meaning of Daniel and Enoch; but Pfeleiderer denies that Jesus used it of himself, since it is doubtful if he proclaimed himself the Messiah. The development of faith in Jesus as Messiah was especially the work of the primitive church, to which, however, only a brief discussion is devoted — a capital fault which this work has in common with many others. The development of baptism and the eucharist as sacraments is regarded as the work of Paul, whose thought was positively influenced by hellenistic and mystery religions and at the same time by Jewish eschatology — two independent streams that united in him. Pfeleiderer, like Holtzmann, recognizes a hellenistic transformation of primitive Christian eschatology, begun by Paul. The greatest achievement of the book in the field of religious history is the recognition and prominence given to the concrete, realistic character of some of Paul's fundamental conceptions, such as that of Spirit.

These forward steps in the understanding of the two fundamental religious elements of the origins of Christianity, namely eschatology and mysteries, centred about the person of Christ, were the fruit of a series of separate investigations.

As regards the eschatology of the teaching of Jesus, Schweitzer (p. 222) rightly remarks that the starting-point of this study is to be found in the work on Jewish apocalyptic, which began with Hilgenfeld, came down to the period of Charles and Volz⁹⁸ (to go no farther), and was given a systematic form by Wilhelm Bousset (1865–1920), in his fundamental work, "Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter" (1903; 3rd ed., 1926, posthumous). In Schweitzer's full discussion of the subject (chapter 15) we see how the ques-

⁹⁸ A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1857); R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity* (1899); P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba* (1903).

tion inevitably raised by these studies of the relation between Jewish apocalyptic and the teaching of Jesus was at first answered in the negative by Timothée Colani (1824–1888)⁹⁹ and Gustav Volkmar (1809–1893),¹⁰⁰ with the difference that the former admitted the presence of an apocalyptic messianic belief at least in the Judaism of the time of Jesus, while the latter denied this, maintaining that the messianic belief was purely political. But Emil Schürer (1844–1910), in his classic “Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,”¹⁰¹ and W. Baldensperger, in “Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit,”¹⁰² proved that on the contrary apocalyptic messianism (that of Daniel) was predominant in the time of Jesus, although afterwards Baldensperger, following Holtzmann’s lead, admitted the familiar dualism of spiritualism and eschatology in Jesus. It was Johannes Weiss (1863–1914), son of Bernhard Weiss, who in a little book of classic brevity, “Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes” (1892),¹⁰³ asserted positively and uncompromisingly the future and transcendental character (apocalyptic as in Daniel) of the conception in the mind of Jesus of the kingdom of God and the Messiah. Jesus, he held, did not intend to establish the kingdom, but he expected it and announced it; the obstacles that he met, especially the inability of the Jews to receive his preaching, led him to the thought of his death as a divine necessity; after this he was to return on the clouds of heaven as the Son of Man of Daniel, and to inaugurate the future aeon. The moral system of Jesus was not a “moral legislation for the community of the kingdom of God,” but the aggregate of the conditions of entrance into the kingdom itself. (This was the beginning of the notion of Jesus’ ethics as an ‘interim’ system.) The social element in the teaching of Jesus is well described and defined; his preaching was addressed to the

⁹⁹ *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps* (1864).

¹⁰⁰ *Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit* (1882).

¹⁰¹ 1874; 4th ed., 1907 ff.

¹⁰² 1888; 2nd ed., 1891. A third edition of the first part, under the title *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums*, was issued in 1903.

¹⁰³ Consisting of only 67 pages. A second edition, much enlarged and somewhat more qualified in statement, was issued in 1900.

'poor,' the 'am ha-arez, the populace, despised by the legalistic pharisees for their inability to learn and observe the law, and among whom moral humiliation was even more characteristic than material poverty, which was not always present.

The meaning of the term Son of Man, which lies at the base of the eschatology of the Synoptics, was illuminated by a linguistic controversy provoked by Hans Lietzmann (1875-) in 1896¹⁰⁴ with his contention that the term could not have been used by Jesus to designate his messiahship because the corresponding Aramaic expression 'barnasha' meant simply 'man.' In the hellenistic Christian churches this word, translated literally into Greek and occurring in sayings of Jesus, was understood as something mysterious, and, being placed in relation to Daniel 7, 13, it was interpreted in a messianic sense and in that sense introduced into the gospel tradition. But the Aramaic scholar Gustav Dalman (1855-), when he made a careful retroversion into Aramaic of the terms expressing fundamental concepts in the Synoptic gospels,¹⁰⁵ took his stand against Lietzmann's thesis, and maintained that Son of Man, in the Galilean Aramaic spoken by Jesus, was not a usual term for 'man' but really had a special significance. Dalman in turn was opposed by Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), who already, in the first edition of his "Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte" (1894), had interpreted the term as equivalent to 'man,' and Wellhausen continued to maintain this interpretation in the successive editions of this work and in his writings on the gospels, of which we shall speak presently.¹⁰⁶ The result of this discussion, independently of the strictly linguistic question, was to support the messianic character of the expression, quite in the apocalyptic sense of Daniel.

In the last chapter of Wellhausen's *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*,¹⁰⁷ entitled 'Das Evangelium,' and in the four small

¹⁰⁴ *Der Menschensohn: ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*. In 1898 Lietzmann returned to the subject in another study, *Zur Menschensohnfrage*.

¹⁰⁵ *Die Worte Jesu, mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache*, I. Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe (1898).

¹⁰⁶ For the polemic against Dalman, see especially Wellhausen's *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 39 ff., and *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI (1899), pp. 187 ff.

¹⁰⁷ First ed., 1894; 7th ed., 1914.

volumes devoted to the Synoptic gospels,¹⁰⁸ this great Semitic scholar added to his denial of a messianic meaning of Son of Man an interpretation of the gospel story as a whole which excluded any truly messianic claim on the part of Jesus. It may be, he says, that Jesus accepted the name of Messiah as an 'Akkommodation' — again the deistic theory! — but he gave it a completely different meaning. He was essentially a teacher, who by teaching that the kingdom of God was not bound up with the temple, or Jerusalem, or the Jewish people, but depended upon individual conditions, proclaimed the end of the Jewish theocracy. By the kingdom of God founded by himself, Jesus meant the church. In spite of this aura of spirituality, the Christ of Wellhausen was not the Christ of liberal Protestantism. He denied the two periods of the career of Jesus, with the subsequent development of his experience into the idea of a providential death, and found a radical change in the ideas of Jesus' disciples after his death, by which he became identified with the transcendental Messiah of Daniel.

This reconstruction of Wellhausen's was very similar to that of William Wrede (1859–1906) in his book, "*Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*,"¹⁰⁹ which appeared in 1901, before Wellhausen's series of little books on the Synoptic gospels. Wrede started with a critical study of the Gospel of Mark, in which he tried to show an irreconcilable discrepancy between the passages in which Mark represents Jesus as the Messiah and those that speak of Jesus as himself maintaining secrecy about his messianic character. Wrede believed that he could prove from Mark's own narrative the falsity of this conception of a secret, and from this primary incongruity, together with other secondary ones, he concluded that the Gospel of Mark was a combination of two representations of Jesus, one, early and historical, of Jesus as a simple teacher, and another, later, dogmatic, and supernatural, of a Jesus-Messiah, the product of the faith of the disciples. The combination had been brought

¹⁰⁸ *Das Evangelium Marci übersetzt und erklärt* (1903); *Das Evangelium Matthaei* (1904); *Das Evangelium Lucae* (1904); *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1905; 2nd ed., 1911).

¹⁰⁹ *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien; zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*.

about by means of this 'messianic secret'; Jesus was represented as keeping secret that which in reality he had never claimed. This is in a way a return to the position of Bruno Bauer, with the difference that the dogmatic development was attributed to the Christian church, and only the literary combination left to the evangelist.

In the same year and with a similar title, Albert Schweitzer (1875-) published "*Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis: eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu*,"¹¹⁰ which represented the antithesis to Wrede in that it explained the public career of Jesus from beginning to end by the messianic self-consciousness (and by that alone) which Wrede would eliminate altogether. The exposition given by Schweitzer was taken up again in his "*Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*" (1906; 2nd ed., 1913),¹¹¹ and it is this later, and for the present final, form of Schweitzer's thought that we shall follow. According to him Johannes Weiss and his followers have made the mistake of applying the eschatological interpretation to the teaching of Jesus only, and not to the whole of his activities, and the same error explains why Wrede was unable to account for Jesus' course of action in Mark. His course of action as well as his teaching must be explained by eschatological dogmatism, which necessarily obliged Jesus to follow a line of conduct entirely different from what would be normal to-day. This is the origin of the incongruity of the gospel history, which literary criticism tries to escape by its analysis of sources and assumption of different strata. The dogmatism is inherent in the conduct of Jesus and is not to be sought in the elaboration of the evangelists.

Exactly what connection Jesus had with John the Baptist is for Schweitzer an insoluble problem, and the reality and the bearing of Jesus' experience of baptism are historically uncertain. Like John, Jesus believed absolutely in the imminence of

¹¹⁰ 1901.

¹¹¹ It may be recalled that in the first edition (1906) the title was *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. Here we are using the edition of 1913. Chapter 21, 'Die Lösung der konsequenten Eschatologie,' is devoted to the positive exposition of the author's thought.

the kingdom. The fact that different grades in the kingdom were recognized made it possible for him to believe that the office of Messiah might fall upon a man, and in his own mind he combined the earthly Messiah of the line of David, foretold by the prophets, with the apocalyptic, transcendental Messiah. He held that the Messiah should be born of the last earthly generation of the descendants of David, and should later be supernaturally transformed through the messianic palingenesis.¹¹² He himself was one of those descendants, and this contributed to the formation in his soul of the messianic consciousness. Jesus kept secret his expectation of being invested as Messiah because of the dogmatic tradition that the Messiah should pass through his earthly existence unrecognized and in an humble station of life, and perhaps also in order to avoid converting those who were in the end to be excluded from the kingdom. This very concern for secrecy and respect for the divine predestination were evident in Jesus' repeated attempts to escape from the crowd and in his teaching by parables, which was designed to hide rather than disclose his meaning. The secret of the parables was not the imminence of the kingdom, for that was openly proclaimed in his public discourses, but the expectation (or rather the dogma) that the advent of the kingdom must necessarily come about through the repentance inaugurated by John the Baptist and further demanded by Jesus. When he sent out the disciples on their mission, Jesus believed that the kingdom would come during the time of their preaching, preceded by the *πείρασμός*, the period of the 'messianic pains'; this we read in the discourse of Matthew, chapter 10. Their return with these expectations unfulfilled was "the first delaying of the parousia," and from that, not from any lack of success in Jesus' preaching, such as the liberal Protestants had asserted, we must explain the fact that from this time Jesus withdrew alone with the disciples to the north and stayed away from the people until his journey to Jerusalem. The distribu-

¹¹² Mark 12, 35-37, where Jesus questions the scribes regarding the Messiah, the son of David, is interpreted by Schweitzer (who here rejects the more common opinion of liberal Protestant critics) as not a negation by Jesus of the Davidic origin of the Messiah. He further holds that Jesus was called 'son of David' without any messianic significance being involved in the use of the term.

tion (not the multiplication) of the loaves and fishes made at the beginning of this second period was an anticipation of the messianic banquet, an eschatological sacrament assuring participation in the kingdom; later the last supper had the same significance as the baptism by John had had at the beginning of the movement. The transfiguration also goes back to a real episode, an ecstasy of the three disciples, in which they received a revelation of the messiahship of Jesus; from this came the confession of Peter, which is wrongly placed before the transfiguration. So the messianic secret "is torn from Jesus by the course of events," and in its place comes "the secret of the passion." Neither Jesus' expectation of coming death nor his resolution to go to Jerusalem to meet death is explained as liberal Protestantism would explain both, by the external situation, but by the belief of Jesus that, in view of the delay of the parousia, the *πειρασμός* preceding the coming of the kingdom by God's will would affect himself alone. Therefore he must give his life "for many," that is, for those predestined to the kingdom. So Jesus identified himself with the Servant of Jahveh in Isaiah, chapter 53. The acclamations of the crowd on Palm Sunday had no messianic significance; the secret of Jesus was revealed only by Judas (herein consisted his sin), and the circumstances of the trial show that the secret was not publicly known until then. At last, before the high priest's tribunal, Jesus confessed it in the sight of all.

We have said that Schweitzer's construction is the antithesis of Wrede's, and we can now add that it is the complementary antithesis. Schweitzer himself had devoted a chapter to an analytical exposition of his agreements with Wrede. Both of them take the texts of the gospels at their full value, and at this alone, interpreting the gospel expressions and religious ideas with strict historical objectiveness and rejecting modernizing psychological interpretations. The result was completely to send to the winds the liberal picture of Jesus. As for the difference between the two, Wrede keeps substantially to this negative result, for his conception of Jesus as simply a teacher (as with Wellhausen) makes inexplicable both the trial and the crucifixion, as well as the succeeding belief in Jesus as the risen

Messiah. Schweitzer's construction, on the other hand, is boldly positive. It combines the maximum of historical truth in the gospels with the maximum of objectivity in the reconstruction of the religious situation and development. To have thought out fully the question of what an absolute belief in eschatology could be in the time of Jesus, and what an equally absolute messianic consciousness could be, and the effect the two beliefs would have in the field of action, is a contribution of the first order to the understanding of the origins of Christianity, and is not to be neglected. But we must not ignore the weakness of more than one of the pillars on which the edifice rests. The internal criticism of the Synoptic tradition is set aside too easily in favor of accepting *en bloc* the evidence of the gospels, at least of the first two. To admit that Jesus had a conception of his destiny so definite and with such a direct influence on his conduct, is extremely questionable, if not actually arbitrary. The disappointment of his expectation of the parousia at the time of the disciples' mission is a brilliant hypothesis, but is incapable of proof, since neither did Jesus speak of it nor do the disciples seem to have had any notion of it. But the most serious fault is that this whole dogmatic eschatology with its developments and its practical applications is kept too exclusively as a personal matter with Jesus, whereas it needs to be explained how a person so shut up within himself could awaken so vast and far-reaching a movement. In this picture we find Jesus' consciousness, but we do not find that of his Jewish hearers, or of Christian believers in him, and so his whole relation to his surroundings remains in shadow. Not that Schweitzer neglects the Jewish messianic belief of the time; he devotes many pages to it, seeking to prove that its chief element was transcendental apocalypticism, and to connect it with the eschatology of Jesus and Paul. But when he comes to speak of the activity of Jesus, the whole development takes place within Jesus' own mind, so that there is a vacillation between a uniform messianism among the people and the isolated self-consciousness of an individual. Consequently Schweitzer also, in his own way, falls within the circle of that psychological interpretation which, not without reason, he condemns in liberal Protestant

criticism. This is especially evident when he unexpectedly brings into the picture the 'eschatological sacraments.' That an intense eschatological expectation should of itself beget in the mind of John the Baptist and of Jesus the idea of a sacrament assuring participation in the kingdom is not so obvious as Schweitzer thinks, and it is not adequately supported by his reference to a passage of the Psalms of Solomon (15, 8) which speaks of a divine sign unto salvation upon the righteous of Israel. Intermediate between the two conceptions, the eschatological and the sacramental, there is another, the conception of 'mystery,' which primitive Christianity could not have derived, as Schweitzer represents it to have done, purely from the eschatological expectations of the Jews.

The field of Paulinism was earlier and more widely cultivated. As early as 1872 Hermann Lüdemann (1842-), in a study of Paul's anthropology in connection with his doctrine of redemption,¹¹³ asserted the realistic, or as he said physico-ethical, character of the concepts of flesh, sin, and redemption in Paul, and attributed a Greek origin to this current of thought, side by side with the Jewish current with its juridical and subjective character, the two uniting in Paul's doctrine of justification. In 1888 Otto Everling wrote on Paul's angelology and demonology,¹¹⁴ bringing out their close relation to later Judaism, and in the same year Hermann Gunkel (1862-) traced a connection between the concept of the Spirit in Paul and the popular beliefs of the apostolic age,¹¹⁵ deciding against any Greek influence. This point was strengthened by Richard Kabisch in a discussion of Paul's eschatology (1893),¹¹⁶ in which he treats the latter as the foundation of Paul's theology and ethics and shows his realistic conception of life, death, and redemption. This view had been defended by Lüdemann, but with the dif-

¹¹³ *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre.*

¹¹⁴ *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie.*

¹¹⁵ *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (1888; 3rd ed., 1909).

¹¹⁶ *Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus.*

ference that what Lüdemann considered Greek, Kabisch took as Jewish.

Three years later (1896) Ernst Teichmann (1869–1919)¹¹⁷ maintained that a complete change to Greek spiritualism took place in the eschatological ideas of the apostle. In spite of such great divergences great advances were made toward an understanding of the true nature of Paul's religion, and this understanding was given a definitive form on two points, baptism and the eucharist, by Wilhelm Heitmüller (1869–1926),¹¹⁸ who eliminated once for all, at least for those capable of understanding it, the symbolical interpretation of the two rites. This fundamental conclusion he reaffirmed and extended to the whole of primitive Christianity in another work of the same year, on the mystical-magic virtue attributed to the name of Jesus, especially in the administration of baptism.¹¹⁹

§ 7. THE 'RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE SCHULE'

Heitmüller's two studies were based on the historical comparison of religions, particularly (but not exclusively) with respect to the mysteries, and they mark an important step in the establishment of the historical method in the study of the origins of Christianity. Attempts in this direction had been made fifteen years earlier by two classical philologists, Hermann Usener (1834–1905)¹²⁰ and Albrecht Dieterich (1866–1908),¹²¹ but the time was not then ripe, and German theology especially was closed against any suggestions from outside the circle of theologians. Gunkel, however, was a theologian, though in the field of the Old Testament, and in 1895 he showed himself truly a pioneer by his book entitled "Schöpfung und Chaos."¹²² In the introduction he affirmed the principle of comparative recon-

¹¹⁷ Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung zu jüdischer Apokalyptik.

¹¹⁸ Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus: Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung (1903).

¹¹⁹ In Namen Jesu: eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe (1903).

¹²⁰ Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen: das Weihnachtsfest (1889).

¹²¹ Abraxas (1891); Nekyia (1893).

¹²² Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12.

struction, and farther on (note on page 209) pointed out the necessity of subordinating literary criticism to historical interpretation — two fundamental points which until then had received scant attention in the study of the New Testament. The body of the book is a study of the first chapter of Genesis and the twelfth chapter of Revelation as points of contact with Babylonian myths of cosmogony and eschatology. While Baur, Pfleiderer, and Holtzmann had recognized the influence of Greek philosophic thought in the New Testament, and others had most opportunely transferred the inquiry into this influence from the field of philosophy to that of religion (the mysteries), Gunkel now came forward with a reminder that the Orient also was significant. This was the first blow struck at the arbitrary dilemma of 'Judaea or Greece,' and the first step toward a synthetic hellenistic-oriental statement of the problem of the religious history of the New Testament. At the same time Gunkel reasserted the religious interpretation of the writings of the New Testament — in this case mythological — as against the rationalistic interpretation — which in this case assumed to be historical and found in the Book of Revelation the reflection of contemporary events.

Another book by Gunkel, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments" (1903),¹²³ covered a still wider field. Having formally established the principle that the words of the writers of the New Testament ought to be explained and compared, and not merely reproduced, thus condemning the purely internal exegesis of the New Testament then prevalent, Gunkel declared that in the mixture of peoples, languages, and divinities formed in the Orient many centuries before the Roman Empire a syncretistic religion of gnostic character must have sprung up, with faith in the resurrection as its central doctrine; further, that this pre-Christian gnosticism must have penetrated into Judaism, where beneath the exclusive official religion other currents of syncretistic character already existed; and finally, that through the medium of Judaism, it must have had an influence on early Christianity, even before the time of Paul. A whole series of elements in Chris-

¹²³ Second edition, without change, 1910.

tianity which do not have their origin in Jesus or in the religious experiences of the disciples are explained by this oriental gnosis. In particular the christology of Paul was not derived chiefly from the influence of Jesus, nor is the vision at Damascus sufficient to explain it. "Earlier than the New Testament the image of the heavenly Christ must somewhere have existed" (p. 93).

With these last words Gunkel formulated a theory destined increasingly to dominate these studies; we may call it the theory of pre-christian Christianity. The problem was therefore to see how far the doctrines of primitive Christianity, instead of being simply a development of faith in Jesus, went back to a preëxisting strain in Jewish or extra-jewish beliefs with which that faith in Jesus had been combined. In almost the same words this theory was developed for Paul by Wrede, only a year after Gunkel's second book, in an essay entitled "Paulus" (1904). In twenty brief pages, brilliantly popular in style, he gave a keen analysis of Paul's theology, bringing out clearly its mystical, realistic, gnostic character, as opposed to all spiritualistic and moralistic interpretations. The doctrine of justification was removed from the central position in the Pauline system generally assigned it by Protestant theology. According to Wrede it grew out of the struggle against Judaism, for when Paul was converted he already had a complete theology, into which he then inserted the two new religious realities — Jesus and the Christian church. But few of Paul's concrete ideas can be explained as mere reflections of his own inner experiences. His representation of Christ did not spring from his impression of the personality of Jesus, nor was it a creation of his own imagination. It had previously been a part of his faith. The distance between Jesus and Paul, which Wrede thinks very great, was only partly filled by the faith of the primitive church, and the latter differed from that of Paul more than was realized by either side. The theology of Paul, which was the foundation of that of the Apostle John, exercised therefore a very powerful influence. It is no proof to the contrary that Paul's doctrine of justification later suffered a setback, for it had never been more than a polemic weapon used in a passing conflict.

The same thesis was treated more analytically than by Wrede, and at greater length, by Martin Brückner in "Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie." His book, like Gunkel's, is of the year 1903 and a year earlier than Wrede's *Paulus*, but he had been in communication with Wrede while writing it. He regards the christology of Paul as wholly Jewish (in the Jewish apocalypses there was already a heavenly man), but it had reached its full development "with the episode of the incarnation of Christ," and the death of Jesus had been the foundation of the universalism of Paul.

Wrede spoke in general terms of a pre-christian doctrine in Paul; Brückner attributed a purely Jewish character to this doctrine;¹²⁴ Gunkel on the contrary proposed an oriental religious syncretism as influencing Christianity, although through the medium of Judaism. In 1904 (the first decade of the new century was remarkably fertile in studies of Christian origins) Richard Reitzenstein (1861-), a classical scholar, published "Poimandres." This, as the title indicates, was a study of the first member of the Corpus Hermeticum, a collection of Greek writings of the period of the Roman empire in which Hermes Trismegistus, a syncretistic figure of Graeco-Egyptian acceptance, developed in the form of dialogue theosophical doctrines on God, the demiurge, the universe, and man. Poimandres is the divine Nous who, under the name 'Shepherd of Man,' effects his revelation. Starting from this point Reitzenstein went on to a more general study of the Corpus Hermeticum. He accepted the date previously proposed, of about A.D. 300, but held the separate writings to be decidedly older, especially insisting that an earlier redaction of the Poimandres had served as a model for the Shepherd of Hermas in the second century. He compared this Hermetic philosophy with other literature of early Christian, Judaeo-Christian, Judaeo-hellenistic (chiefly Philo), and Egyptian origin, and concluded that it had been handed down in a hellenistic-egyptian community. Here a

¹²⁴ Later, however, Brückner discussed briefly in its relation to Christianity the myth of the 'god dying and rising again' of the mysteries, in *Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland in den orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhältnis zum Christentum* (1908).

nucleus of Egyptian doctrines had been combined with an oriental (Babylonian or Perso-Babylonian) myth of Anthropos, the heavenly primitive man, who fell into the slavery of matter and then was made free and finally restored to divinity. This myth of Anthropos¹²⁵ was naturally compared with the heavenly man of Paul, and the conclusion reached that in Hermetic thought we have a pre-Christian, oriental gnostic doctrine which was connected with primitive Christianity. Later Reitzenstein returned to the myth of Anthropos in the second part of his "*Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*" (1906), in which he discussed the Hymn of the Soul in the apocryphal Acts of Thomas.

In these investigations of Reitzenstein the oriental religions that had become diffused through the Roman empire played a considerable part. New and important contributions to their study were made by Albrecht Dieterich (who published a presumed Mithraic liturgy¹²⁶ and in this connection discussed pagan and Christian mysteries in general), and above all by Franz Cumont (1868-), a Belgian scholar who with the learning and accuracy of an archaeologist and philologist combined uncommon abilities in the investigation and reconstruction of religious history. Cumont, after making a special study of Mithraism,¹²⁷ wrote a work of synthesis, "*Les Religions Orientales dans l'empire romain*" (1906; 2nd ed., 1909), in which, though the connection of these religions with Christianity was not discussed, yet the analogies between the two sides were made obvious as a consequence of the prevalent syncretistic character of the oriental religions.¹²⁸ It now became evident

¹²⁵ One of the principal documents for this myth is a writing of the gnostic (Christian) sect of the Naassenes, preserved by Hippolytus, of which the primitive pagan nucleus had already been determined by Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen* (1901).

¹²⁶ *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903). This was a study of some of the most important doctrines of the mysteries, particularly that of the soul ascending through the heavens. Dieterich laid stress on the Greek element at the expense of the oriental.

¹²⁷ *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra* (2 vols., 1896, 1900); *Les mystères de Mithra* (1899; 3rd ed., 1913).

¹²⁸ More recently Cumont has published a number of studies, both general and special, to illustrate religious conditions in the oriental-hellenistic-roman world. We may mention particularly his *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (1912).

that for the study of Christian origins it was necessary to go beyond the separate oriental mystery-religions, which appear clearly individualized in the period of the empire, to the ferment of syncretism in the hellenistic-roman world at and before the beginning of our era. This task had already been formulated by Reitzenstein in his *Poimandres*, and was brought well toward realization in his brilliant though unsystematic work entitled "Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen" (1910).¹²⁹ A group of religious terms and concepts — gnosis, mystery, sacrament, spirit, salvation, rebirth — was carefully analyzed and compared in the hellenistic religious sources, including inscriptions, papyri, literary testimonies regarding the beliefs and rites of the mysteries, the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, Hermetic writings, Chaldean oracles; and these were compared with analogous terms and conceptions in the earliest Christian literature, particularly the epistles of Paul. In general, and in his final conclusions, Reitzenstein was reserved, almost timid (perhaps with a *timor reverentialis* toward his theological compatriots), but he pointed out clearly and suggestively the several coincidences of phraseology and ideas, maintaining the priority of the hellenistic element and its influence on Christian thought and expression.

With these researches the problem of gnosticism came up again and was brought into definite shape. The prevailing view, embodied in Harnack's classic *Dogmengeschichte*, had been that gnosticism represents an heretical, new formation within Christianity, and that it was the result of the hasty attempt to transform Christian revelation into a philosophy, being, to use Harnack's expression, "the acute hellenization of Christianity." The recognition of the previous existence of the gnostic element within the sphere of hellenistic oriental religion led naturally to three conclusions about gnosticism: (1) that it was a pre-Christian, pagan phenomenon instead of a Christian heresy; (2) that its religious character was mythical, realistic, and mys-

¹²⁹ This was a lecture given in Strasburg in 1909, amplified in publication by the addition of a great number of notes and excursus. The book went through successive enlargements (2nd ed., 1920; 3rd ed., 1927).

tical rather than philosophical; and (3) that it was of oriental (that is, hellenistic oriental), not of Greek, origin. All these conclusions were clearly stated by Bousset in his "Hauptproblem der Gnosis" (1907),¹³⁰ not a large book but rich in content, effectively arranged, and well exhibiting its author's exceptional gifts for such research. Here for the first time Gunkel's theory was put on a sound basis and even somewhat amplified, for Bousset reached the result that a religious evolution began from Persia and ancient Babylonia, then passed to the hellenistic-roman world, and finally was engulfed in Christianity, Mandaeanism, and Manichaeism. Indeed, one of the striking new features of this book is the importance for Christianity assigned to these two religions and their writings, all somewhat late, but believed to contain much more ancient elements.¹³¹

That this emphasis on the hellenistic oriental element in the religious environment of Christian origins is not opposed to the historical derivation of Christianity from Judaism, is pointed out (though to do so was not his main purpose) by a liberal Jewish scholar, Moritz Friedländer (1842-1919), in tracing the various religious currents in the Judaism of the time of Jesus.¹³² His primary thesis was that the Judaism of that period was more varied and less fixed in character than is commonly supposed, and to this he added an interpretation, partially new,¹³³ of the 'am ha-arez, the non-pharisaic mass of the people. According to Friedländer, the 'am ha-arez did not constitute a lower class without education and religiously indifferent, but

¹³⁰ In the introduction Bousset acknowledges as predecessors Kessler, for his studies in Mandaeanism and Manichaeism and for his memoir, *Ueber Gnosis und altbabylonische Religion* (1882); Brandt, for his studies in Mandaeanism; Anz, *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus* (1897); and Gruppe, for what he says briefly in § 310 of his *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (1906), especially on pp. 1619, 1622.

¹³¹ A similar attempt was made at about the same time by H. Gressmann, in *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), in which he asserted the popular, mystic-apocalyptic, oriental element in Hebrew prophecy.

¹³² *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (1905).

¹³³ Not so new, however, as Friedländer seems to have thought. Critical theology in Germany had repeatedly called attention to the importance of the 'am ha-arez for the propaganda of Jesus. Compare especially what is said above (pp. 317-318) about Johannes Weiss.

had its own religious currents of thought, which were active, though different from and opposed to the religion of the pharisees, and of the sadducees as well. Apocalyptic is the religious expression of the 'am ha-arez, and both these people and their religion were under the influence of hellenistic Judaism in their individualistic, universalistic tendencies, and in their more liberal attitude toward the law, as well as in the transcendental development of the messianic idea. Another hellenistic and anti-pharisaic movement, which also made its appeal to the people, though only through secret propaganda, was essenism. These anti-pharisaical, Judaeo-hellenistic religious currents reached their highest manifestation in the movements of John the Baptist and of Jesus. Some years later¹³⁴ Friedländer placed the origin of the Baptist's movement specifically in the diaspora beyond the Jordan, connecting it with the Jewish sect of the Nazarenes of which Epiphanius speaks. John had brought the movement over into Judaea. From the Nazarene circle came Jesus, and this, not a village of Nazareth, was the origin of his name, though he did not actually belong to the sect.

The identification of 'Nazarenus' or 'Nazoraeus' (a name given not only to Jesus but also to the first believers) with the pre-Christian Jewish sect of the Nazaraei was made also by Luigi Salvatorelli ("Il significato di Nazareno," 1911). He connected the Christian epithet with the Hebrew 'nazir' on one side (John the Baptist is represented as a nazirite in the gospel tradition) and with the Greek *ἅγιοι* on the other side. The term *ἅγιοι*, *sancti*, with a technical meaning, was assumed by the first believers in Jesus. It had been used for a community 'set apart,' 'consecrated,' a pre-Christian Jewish church with gnostic elements, out of which John the Baptist, Jesus, and the primitive Christian church came.

Beside the Nazaraei of Epiphanius, Salvatorelli brought the Mandaeans into the field, recalling that they too were called Nazaraei and had worshipped John the Baptist. Thus in place of the Greek influence on which Friedländer had laid stress (accentuating the philosophic, speculative element in the Jewish

¹³⁴ Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfängen (1908).

currents which he studied, and passing over the mystical and mysterious element) the influence of the oriental environment was again distinctly assumed. The same position was taken by Max Maurenbrecher (1874-) in his two volumes of "researches on the general historical connections of primitive Christianity."¹³⁵ His main thesis was that the entire doctrinal system of primitive Christianity was radically different from the gospel message of Jesus (as Wrede and Wellhausen had already contended), and that therefore not only the christology of Paul (as Wrede saw) but also that of the primitive Christian church represented an application to Jesus of a doctrine of the death and resurrection of a Christ the Saviour which had come into Judaism from the oriental religions. Jesus of Nazareth himself appeared as a representative of the lower classes, while early Christianity represented a combination of three strains, from Jerusalem, from Galilee, and from the hellenistic world. Maurenbrecher's thought was summed up in the words: "Christianity is the combination of a myth of very ancient origin with the memories of a man who actually lived."¹³⁶

From several directions, therefore, and by several roads, the origins of Christianity were now traced back to a pre-Christian religious sphere which was not solely that of orthodox and biblical Judaism, but to some extent represented a pre-Christian paganism. This result was reached also through consideration of special features that were not without importance, such as the religious value of the fish in early Christianity. H. Schmidt, in a study of the book of Jonah,¹³⁷ declared that there must have been a belief in a 'fish saviour' before Jesus. Franz Joseph Dölger, also, in his large work on this Christian symbol,¹³⁸ adduced pagan parallels, especially those connected with

¹³⁵ Von Nazareth nach Golgotha: Untersuchungen über die weltgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge des Urchristentums (1909); Von Jerusalem nach Rom: weitere Untersuchungen, etc. (1910).

¹³⁶ A little later Maurenbrecher showed some tendency to accept the radical denial of the historical existence of Jesus.

¹³⁷ Jona: eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte (1907).

¹³⁸ Ichthys. Vol. I: Das Fischsymbol in frühchristlicher Zeit (1910); vol. II (text), vol. III (plates): Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum (1922).

the cult of the Syrian goddess Atargatis. In connection with the legend of Jonah and the whale, Schmidt discussed also the descensus ad inferos of Jesus, the connection of the sea with the kingdom of the dead, and the picture of the Messiah issuing from the sea in Fourth Ezra. These last two points were taken up by Franz Dibelius in a study of the eucharist,¹³⁹ and carried to the conclusion that Jesus and John the Baptist had already thought of baptism as a mystic death and a communion of life and death with the Messiah, and that Jewish apocalyptic already knew the belief in the Messiah dying and rising from the dead. This work of Dibelius was hasty and dogmatic in its assumptions; it denied any importance to literary criticism, and was evidently controlled by conservative theological interests. Nevertheless, it presented one interesting point, in carrying back the ideas of mystery beyond Paul and beyond the pre-pauline Christianity to Jesus himself instead of to John the Baptist, or even to Judaism.

These discussions gave enhanced importance to John the Baptist and his connection with Jesus, and to John's followers and their connection with the earliest Christian church. Now Martin Dibelius,¹⁴⁰ in a thorough and careful study of the subject, although primarily pursuing literary criticism, reached some noteworthy historical conclusions. In agreement with Friedländer he recognized a multiplicity of religious currents within the sphere of Judaism, especially among the 'am ha-arez, with which the movements of John the Baptist and Jesus were especially connected. Jesus was for a time a follower of John; the Baptist's followers continued to be of considerable importance; and elements of this sort must have been found in the various semi-christian groups that sprang up in Galilee and in hellenistic territory, and were accessible to the influence of hellenistic oriental mystery religions. The passages on John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel are part of a polemic against such persons. The disciples of John must have claimed that he

¹³⁹ Das Abendmahl: eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der christlichen Religion (1911).

¹⁴⁰ Die urchristliche Ueberlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer (1911).

was greater than Jesus and that he was the Messiah.¹⁴¹ Hereby the problem of the historical content of the Fourth Gospel was put in a new light.¹⁴²

§ 8. LATER STUDIES; RADICAL CRITICISM

It would however be a great mistake to suppose that in the first decade of the twentieth century the whole of German historical theology was penetrated by this new spirit of concrete research and historical religious reconstruction. Harnack's "Das Wesen des Christentums" appeared in 1900, and has been frequently reprinted, the issue of 1908 being a new edition with notes. It represents the 'acute spiritualization' of the gospel; all realistic messianism and eschatology is eliminated, the kingdom of God interpreted as a present spiritual reality ("the kingdom of God is within you"), and the (spiritual) fatherhood of God taken as the essence of the gospel and of Christianity. Although it would not be unfair to consider this famous book as a religious manifesto rather than an historical study, yet in the fourth edition of his *Dogmengeschichte* (1909) Harnack maintains the same positions, reinforcing them with notes derogatory of the whole method of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule.' Just at the threshold of the new century, when this method was ready to assert itself more fully, Oskar Holtzmann in his "Leben Jesu" (1901) had again clearly delineated the liberal conception of Jesus, with all its characteristic features: the kingdom of God as future but "penetrating" into the present; the messianic consciousness of Jesus as taking shape with the experience of baptism; the Son of Man as an "accentuation of pure humanity"; a period of success and a period of failure in the preaching of Jesus; the confession of

¹⁴¹ In this, Dibelius was developing the ideas of Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums* (1898), who in turn had had predecessors at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Dibelius, however, did not accept Baldensperger's theory that the Johannine christology was influenced by this rivalry with the Baptist's followers.

¹⁴² A purely literary development of this, however, and one which has led to no definite result, consists of the hypotheses as to a multiplicity of documents and revisions, proposed by Eduard Schwartz, 'Aporien im vierten Evangelium' (*Göttingische Nachrichten*, 1907-08), and Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (1908). Details may be found in the second edition of Loisy's *Quatrième Évangile* (1921) and in Goguel's *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, vol. II.

Peter as representing the rejection of the traditional view of the Messiah by the disciples. Again, six years later, in his "Christus" (1907), Oskar Holtzmann presented the same views, though in a more succinct, popular, and edifying form. Paul Wernle, in a study of the Christian hope of the kingdom,¹⁴³ maintained the dualism of the kingdom in the mind of Jesus, as both future and present. Rejecting the distinction between a period in which Jesus believed in the immediate coming of the kingdom and another in which he looked for it in connection with his own future return, he only reiterated more firmly the anti-eschatological interpretation. More significant is it to find in Bousset, an adherent of the new 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode,' survivals of the old attitude of mind. His popular portrayal of Jesus ("Jesus," 1904), though recognizing the future character of the kingdom and rejecting the interpretation of an inner development of Jesus' thought, yet followed Harnack in considering faith in a living and present God as "the inmost kernel" of the gospel. He holds that Jesus did not at once proclaim himself as the Messiah because he had a "profound and immediate sense" of the distance between this title and his own inmost consciousness; he deems the messiahship "a heavy burden under which he was silent until almost the end of his life," and while acknowledging the transcendental meaning of Son of Man, makes this less a central idea with Jesus than a 'presentiment,' called forth by the prevision of his death — here too following the liberal Protestant interpretation. Bousset does not admit the conception of an expiatory death as a part of Jesus' thought, and excludes any sacramental character from the last supper.

The ideas of Paul formed a subject in which the preparation for the new trend had been fuller, and the preconceived theological interest not so strong as in the case of Jesus,¹⁴⁴ but Heinrich Weinel published a study of Paul¹⁴⁵ which was idealistic, psychological, and individualistic in the extreme, as is evident from

¹⁴³ Die Reichsgotteshoffnung in den ältesten christlichen Dokumenten und bei Jesus (1903).

¹⁴⁴ Yet the interest was fairly strong; consider the theory of justification.

¹⁴⁵ Paulus: der Mensch und sein Werk; die Anfänge des Christentums, der Kirche und des Dogmas (1904).

the very headings of chapters: 'the searcher after God'; 'the contest over the law' (Paul's presumed experience of the insufficiency of the law); 'the prophet'; 'the apostle'; 'the theologian'; 'the man.' The emphasis was primarily on the doctrine of justification by faith; the relation between Jesus and God was the main point discussed in the christology of Paul; eschatology, gnosticism, and all questions of connections drawn from the history of religions find no place. The work of Carl Clemen¹⁴⁶ was also one of psychological and theological character. A French Protestant scholar, Maurice Goguel, in a detailed analytical comparison of the teaching of Jesus with that of Paul,¹⁴⁷ reached the interesting conclusion that the central idea in the former was salvation as a concrete reality, while Paul's thought was chiefly an analysis of the means of bringing about that salvation. But Goguel did not draw from the nucleus of truth in his conclusion all the results of which it is capable, for he left out the sacramentalism and gnosticism of Paul and the problem of religious history which they involve. The "Paulus" of Adolf Deissmann¹⁴⁸ represented an advance only in appearance, for his substitution of sentiment and religious experience for the intellectualistic theological element does not bring out from its isolation the figure of Paul, whom he spiritualizes after modern patterns; nor does the description of the Mediterranean physical environment, so accurately drawn by Deissmann, fill the gap. Here, too, the importance of sacramentalism was disparaged, and the influence of mythical conceptions and of connection with the hellenistic mystery religions altogether ignored.

More general accounts of Christian origins also appeared, but they were in part antiquated and superficial. Wernle's work dealing with this theme¹⁴⁹ included a very scanty introduction on Judaism and nothing at all on the pagan world. In pre-pauline Christianity,¹⁵⁰ he ignored the importance of Stephen

¹⁴⁶ Paulus. Vol. I, Untersuchung; vol. II, Darstellung (1904).

¹⁴⁷ L'apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ (1904).

¹⁴⁸ Paulus: eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze (1911; 2nd ed., entirely rewritten, 1925). I have used the second edition.

¹⁴⁹ Die Anfänge unserer Religion (1901; 2nd ed., 1904).

¹⁵⁰ For Jesus, see the work of the same author analyzed above (p. 336).

and the hellenistic community at Antioch; the discussion of paulinism was purely internal, with the usual extreme psychological treatment of the 'experience' on the road to Damascus. The Fourth Gospel was dealt with in the part devoted to 'the formation of the church,' and there only in a paragraph on Greek philosophy, which shows that Wernle misunderstood both the religious meaning of that gospel and its place in history. Gnosticism was of course treated only in this second period, though it was acknowledged to have had its roots in pre-christian times, outside of Judaism. Even Johannes Weiss, in 1910 — after the appearance of the works of Gunkel, Heitmüller, and Wrede, of Reitzenstein's *Poimandres* and Bousset's *Hauptproblem* — in dealing with the christology of primitive Christianity,¹⁵¹ put a greatly exaggerated emphasis on the psychological explanation of it by the impression made by the personality of Jesus — and that not only for the primitive church but also for Paul, whose idea of Christ, even in his anti-christian period, must, he thinks, have contained "a great many concrete traits which he had observed in the living Christ."

Against this persistent tendency toward abstract idealization, a vigorous attack was launched, as early as 1902, by a French scholar, Alfred Loisy (1857–; at that time a Roman Catholic priest), in a small book, "*L'Évangile et l'Église*," which is a true model of historical treatment, both organic in construction and consistent up to the last consequences. His starting-point was a criticism of Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums*, but his attack was directed against the theological method of the whole school, and he ended by attaining a constructive general conception of the problem of Christianity. In the first chapter (added in the second edition, 1904) on the sources of the gospels, he clearly defined the criticism of these sources as not a purely literary problem but one of religious history. The two following chapters, on the kingdom of heaven and the Son of God, with firm, incisive strokes make it clear that the message of Jesus consisted not in a new knowledge of God the Father, but in the announcement of the heavenly kingdom still

¹⁵¹ *Jesus im Glauben des Urchristentums* (1910), a lecture.

to come, which was to have a realistic and social character and was not to be confounded with the remission of sins (which was merely a preparatory condition of its coming) or with the action of God in individual hearts and the practical union of the soul with God. In the moral system of Jesus, which is to be interpreted as having only a temporary value in view of the coming of the kingdom, the absolute fulfilment of the hope was dependent upon a complete renunciation. The separation of the idea of the Son of God from that of the Messiah (the dominant theme of *Das Wesen des Christentums*) was shown to be absurd, since the latter preceded the former, and sonship to God belonged to Jesus "not by reason of his spiritual disposition and religious experiences, but because of his providential function, as the sole agent of the celestial kingdom" (page 91 of the second edition). To detach Jesus from the subsequent development of Christianity was as unreasonable as to isolate him from Judaism. This later development of Christianity, to which the last three chapters of the book (on the church and on Christian dogma and worship) were devoted, was conceived not as the fortuitous envelope of an unchanging core, but as an organic growth from an original germ, the continuity of which, being static not dynamic, was due to the persistence of the original impulse and spirit, not to any peculiar belief, formulated once and for all.

A little later Loisy developed his views analytically and from a point of view more largely that of literary criticism in two volumes of "*Les Évangiles synoptiques*" (1907-08).¹⁵² This had been preceded by "*Le quatrième évangile*" (1903), in which a radically and completely allegorical-mystical interpretation of this gospel was presented, and the gospel itself excluded, with a corresponding radical completeness, from the historical sources for Jesus. Indeed, even in these works of Loisy, full as they are of historical sense, the internal analysis of the New Testament writings is almost exclusively dominant, and no effort is made to set the whole picture in its background of religious history. The need of this setting was implied in

¹⁵² The volume entitled *Jésus et la tradition évangélique* (1910) is taken from the long introduction of this work.

Loisy's explanation of the development of Christianity, which he represented as having come about in contact with and through reaction to the successive environments in which it had existed, and somewhat later he explicitly recognized this need. In principle, Loisy's *L'Évangile et l'Église* can be said to mark the disappearance of the 'liberal' conception of Jesus, but only in principle, for the book attracted little attention outside of Catholic circles, and in fact it represented an episode in the modernist controversy rather than in the historical investigation of the origins of Christianity. Characteristic of its reception is a simple citation in a note by the indefatigable Schweitzer, pointing out the conflict between Loisy and the authority of the church.¹⁵³ And now Schweitzer himself was confronted by the same opponent whose theories had already been confuted by Loisy, and against him he launched his attack with the full force of his eschatological theory in his book, "Von Reimarus zu Wrede" (1906). Criticism of the idealistic liberal Protestant interpretation of Jesus and his message was in evidence throughout the book, but it was especially concentrated in three chapters: 'The liberal Lives of Jesus' (against Strauss's second Life, Holtzmann, Keim, Bernhard Weiss, etc.); 'The investigation concerning the life of Jesus at the turn of the century' (where the pages criticizing Oskar Holtzmann are especially to be noted); 'The criticism of the modern historical view by Wrede and by Consistent Eschatology.' Schweitzer's body of criticism was completed five years later in his "Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung" (1911), a book but little less important than the first, though it attracted less attention. Here, too, after attacking the use made of Paul's letters as material for *loci theologici*, he turns his artillery on the spiritualistic interpretation of these letters at the expense of an objective and unitary study. He maintained the realistic, mystical value of Paul's conceptions and terms and their purely eschatological origin and meaning, but the constructive part of the work was only blocked out, a fuller treatment being re-

¹⁵³ For the history of the controversy to which this book gave rise within the Catholic Church, Loisy's further publication, *Autour d'un petit livre* (1903), must be kept in mind. It is itself useful also in defining Loisy's positions on exegesis and history.

served for another volume on the mysticism of Paul which has never been issued.

Schweitzer's uncompromising insistence on eschatology led him in both books to attack on two fronts — against liberal theology on the right and against the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule' on the left. The attack on the latter, in the last three chapters of his first book (added in the second edition of 1913), was devoted largely to reviewing and combating the mythological hypothesis (of which we shall speak presently), which he considered an unwarranted application of the method of comparative history. But this topic was treated more fully and more systematically in his second book, where it occupied the whole of a long chapter. Schweitzer's criticism began with the usual objections on the ground of method, which however affected only exaggerated or misdirected applications of the historical method, and on the ground of chronology, where they were due only to his own imperfect knowledge of the historical material used in the comparative analysis. Aside from these objections his opposition to the historical school was based on three assumptions. First, he assumed that the mystical and mystery element in Paul and before Paul (for Schweitzer, as we have seen, admitted this element in Jesus also) can be completely explained by the eschatological expectation and only by that. Secondly, he held that it is absurd to claim a direct contact of Paul with the Orient, for such contacts do not go farther than later Judaism. Thirdly, "later Judaism had no connection with Graeco-oriental syncretism at the time of the beginning of our era" (*Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, p. 542). This last statement shows again how little knowledge Schweitzer had of the relevant material.¹⁵⁴ The second assumption is entirely arbitrary, since the countries in which Paul lived

¹⁵⁴ Reitzenstein replied ('*Religionsgeschichte und Eschatologie*,' in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1912, pp. 1-28): "It is a mistake to say that Judaism had a negative attitude toward gnosticism." In this he found fault with Schweitzer for having too narrow an idea of eschatology, which as a matter of fact was not lacking in gnosticism. He rejected the 'autochthonous' explanation of the eschatological sacraments, pointed out the unreasonableness of Schweitzer's separation between language and idea, and made it clear that the theory of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule' did not deny the fact of individual religious personalities.

lay mostly within the sphere of diffusion of the hellenistic-oriental religious ideas and mystery religions. And even if his contention were well founded, it would not prove his point unless the third assertion also were valid. The first assumption of Schweitzer, that the mystery element is explained alone by eschatology, has been mentioned above in criticizing his reconstruction of Jesus' activities. It is evident that such an assumption was the result of his theory that the mysticism of the gospels and that of Paul were in complete opposition to hellenistic mysticism, a theory wholly artificial and reached by over-emphasizing the differences and belittling the similarities between the two. Moreover, there was in his reasoning a *petitio principii*, for he assumes the existence of a class of "eschatological mysteries," without explaining how eschatology, with its collective, future, and mechanically transcendental character, attained the individual, actual, and mystically immanent character of a mystery.

A book by Ernesto Buonaiuti, "Lo gnosticismo" (1907), may be associated with this reaction against the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule.' This Italian scholar, at the time very young, contended, with bold originality of statement, that gnosticism was the aristocratic reaction of an abstract and individualistic intellectualism against the social eschatological currents that flowed from the preaching of the gospel. Thus he held to the conception of gnosticism as predominantly philosophic and derived from Christianity. But the vital historical sense with which the social actions and reactions caused by the Christian movement were viewed was full of suggestion. Buonaiuti's eschatological theory was derived rather from Loisy than from Schweitzer, whose book had barely appeared; but his sense of social realities was his own.

The insistence of the liberal theology on the old positions has been matched by the mythological negation, which at the end of this decade attained its greatest development and directed its attack against the liberals.

The beginnings of the radical criticism of to-day, which denies the existence of Jesus, go back to the end of the eight-

eenth century, to the works of Charles François Dupuis (1742–1809) and Constantine François Volney (1757–1820). Of these writers, Volney, in a few pages of "*Les Ruines, ou Méditation sur les Révolutions des Empires*" (1791), Dupuis in a full discussion in the third volume of his "*L'origine de tous les cultes, ou Religion universelle*" (1795), reduced Jesus Christ to a solar myth, although they gave almost no evidence for that view except a series of relations between certain data in the New Testament and the facts of astronomy. Their works, however, had no influence on later German historical research concerning Jesus. The mythological interpretation of the New Testament tradition in Germany was founded by Strauss, as we know, with a systematic and thorough analysis of the texts; but his interpretation did not assail the historical existence of Jesus, and had nothing in common with the astral mythology of Volney and Dupuis, since the essential point with Strauss consisted in the application of Old Testament ideas to the figure of Jesus Christ.

We have already seen (pp. 296 f.) how Bruno Bauer, starting with Strauss's thesis that the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel had a purely literary existence, turned to the Jesus of the Synoptic gospels and denied altogether the historical existence of Jesus. Bauer made Jesus not the product of myth-making, but the literary creation of a writer who was expressing symbolically the experiences and aspirations of a religious movement. So the mythological interpretation was transformed into symbolism, which, since it drew its elements from the hellenistic-roman world, was moreover syncretistic. Bauer thus appears as the forerunner of the comparative school, except that he looked for the formative elements of Christianity primarily in the sphere of philosophy rather than that of religion. In any case he furnished the scheme used by later deniers of the historical existence of Jesus. On the one hand, they said, the sources do not give us anything absolutely certain about Jesus, and on the other, the creation of his person and the origin of Christianity can be accounted for from the conditions of the time.

Bauer joined to his denial of the historical existence of Jesus

a denial also of the genuineness of all of Paul's epistles. Both these theses are found again in the radical Dutch school,¹⁵⁵ put forward in 1878 by Allard Pierson (1831–1896), in a book on the Sermon on the Mount,¹⁵⁶ then developed by Abraham Loman (1823–1897) beginning with a lecture in 1881, and later amplified by Loman, in collaboration with others, in more extensive writings.¹⁵⁷ In 1886 Pierson also, with Samuel Naber (1828–1913), published “*Verisimilia*,” of which the primary object was an analytical and destructive criticism of the epistles of Paul. Willem van Manen (1842–1905), on the contrary, who always remained a believer in the historical existence of Jesus, did not go further in his “*Paulus*” (3 vols., 1890, 1891, 1896) than to deny the genuineness of the epistles of Paul. The whole Dutch school, in fact, was more in accord in this denial than in excluding the historical existence of Jesus. We find, however, the negative elements of more recent radicalism in their criticism of the method of the liberals, who, they urged, made on purely subjective grounds their own selection from the data of the New Testament, and in their contention that the New Testament gives us the story not of a human but of a divine being, as well as in the importance which they assigned to the silence of secular writers. We can further see their relation to subsequent radicalism in the assertion that with a merely human Jesus it is impossible to explain the origin of Christianity, and in the thesis, destined to become the battle-standard of W. B. Smith and Drews, that in the attempts to explain the myth of Jesus both human and divine the hypothesis that he was merely a man stands on an equality with the hypothesis that he was merely a god, and, considered *a priori*, has the same weight. The Dutch school also took some steps toward a positive reconstruction, with the use of the Servant of Jahveh of Second Isaiah and the Son of Man of apocalyptic literature, the myth of a god dying and rising again, and in general the combination of Jewish and hellenistic elements. It remains true, nevertheless,

¹⁵⁵ On this compare G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Die holländische radikale Kritik des Neuen Testaments* (1912, translated from the Dutch; English translation, *Radical Views about the New Testament*, 1912).

¹⁵⁶ *De Bergrede en andere synoptische Fragmenten* (1878).

¹⁵⁷ Especially ‘*Quaestiones paulinae*,’ in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1882 ff.

that in this school the criticism of the New Testament was predominantly literary, and that it did not prosper because it was generally treated with scorn by other specialists, particularly the German theologians.

More closely allied to Bauer than to the Dutch school was the German pastor, Albert Kalthoff (1850–1906), who reopened radical criticism in Germany with two books, “Das Christusproblem” (1902; 2nd ed., 1903) and “Die Entstehung des Christentums” (1904). He too thought Jesus a symbolic creation of the church, but this creation, instead of being explained by the philosophic ideas of the time, is considered the product of a social proletarian element, of ‘communistic clubs,’ which were at once religious associations and mystery cults. Jesus embodied both the ideal of the lower classes, oppressed and aspiring to redemption, and that of the organized Christian church, which, through its firmly unified discipline, absorbed the revolutionary elements into its own universal communism and assigned an earthly realization to apocalyptic aspirations. The whole life and teaching of Jesus, beginning with his double nature corresponding to the twofold nature of the church, was held to be a symbolic representation of the life and varying fortunes of the Christian church. Kalthoff’s work did not meet with great success. Besides lacking a basis in literary criticism, of which he gave only bare suggestions in his second book, he started with the unfounded assumptions of a proletarian movement in the first century, and of its association with the mysteries, and did not provide the necessary religious substratum for the creation of Christ and Christianity.

In England John M. Robertson chose another path, in his “Christianity and Mythology” (1900; 2nd ed., 1910), “A Short History of Christianity” (1902), and “Pagan Christs” (1902; 2nd ed., 1911). He returned to the astral mythology of Volney and Dupuis, but with an important addition. He believed it possible to reconstruct a pre-Christian cult of Jesus, going back to ancient Israel, similar or even identical with a cult of Joshua, a solar divinity, probably of the Ephraimites. This cult, in which Jesus was worshipped also under the symbols of the bull and the lamb, was united with another Palestinian

cult, that of Osiris-Tammuz, and from the dramatization of the birth and death of the god the myth of Jesus was derived. 'Jesuisism,' the worship of Jesus, which at first was kept secret and had few adherents, became widely diffused and finally triumphed after the destruction of Jerusalem. Robertson's analysis of the gospel narratives claimed to show how they could be resolved into a series of myths.

The reconstruction of this pre-christian cult, scarcely more than theoretically postulated by Robertson, was attempted independently by an American professor of mathematics, William Benjamin Smith (1850-). In his "*Der vorchristliche Jesus*," translated by A. Diederichs and published in Germany (1906; 2nd ed., 1911), he brought together five essays purporting to show: (1) that the cult of Jesus, a divine, not a human, being, had developed in various centres of the Mediterranean world in the period from the first century before Christ to the first century after Christ (for this, among other evidence, he used the notices of Apollos and the disciples of John the Baptist in Acts 18 and 19); (2) that the appellation Nazarene or Nazoraëus signified 'protector,' 'guardian,' not 'native of Nazareth,' and was the name of a pre-christian Jewish sect mentioned by Epiphanius; (3) that 'anastasis' in the New Testament did not at first mean the resurrection of Jesus but his enthronement by God as Messiah, lord of the world; (4) that the parable of the sower referred originally to the seeds of the Logos, sown by God to form the world; (5) that there is no trace of Paul's Epistle to the Romans in Christian literature before the middle of the second century. Smith's innovation consisted in his attempt to deduce positive evidence for the new mythological reconstruction of the origins of Christianity, and for a presumed pre-christian Christianity, from the same internal analysis of Christian literature that had previously been used chiefly for negative purposes. The negative aim, however, was predominant in his "*Ecce Deus*" (published, also by Diederichs, in 1911), where the chief positive element is the thesis that the earliest Christian preaching had been essentially a crusade of monotheism against idolatry, and that the kingdom of God signified the victory of monotheism.

All these works, including *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, which was introduced to German theologians by one of their accepted teachers, P. W. Schmiedel, passed almost unnoticed. On the contrary a great sensation was produced, and a lively and copious polemic evoked, by "*Die Christusmythe*" (1910) of Arthur Drews (1865-), which contained almost nothing new but made good use of the work of others: the radical criticism of the gospels, the astral mythology of Dupuis and Volney, the symbolism of Bauer, the derivation from the Old Testament and from ideas of Judaism accepted by the Dutch scholars and by students of later Judaism, the syncretism of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule,' the pre-Christian Christianity of W. B. Smith. The effect of Drews's work was perhaps due to its gathering together, though not very systematically, all the material and all the arguments that had been so far used against the historical existence of Jesus, and perhaps still more to the fact that no one, not even Schweitzer, had so bitterly assailed the arbitrary theological approach of liberal Protestantism to the historical study of Jesus, and the worthlessness of its view not only as history but as religion. Never before had the denial of the historical existence of Jesus been united with such a firm determination to destroy Christianity in the name of a monistic philosophy. The second part of the work, published in 1911 with the sub-title, "*Die Zeugnisse für die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu*," was only a polemic development of the negative criticism already to be found in the first part.

The starting-point of this radical criticism, clearly stated by the Dutch school, is that the acceptance of the historical existence of Jesus and the opposite view are alike theories, moving in the same plane, each developing a single aspect of the tradition, which shows us Jesus as both man and God. Now to put these two views on the same plane is an historical error because what tradition gives us is a human Jesus, who was born, lived, and died on this earth, while the representation of him as a divine being is only a profession of faith on the part of the writers of the New Testament, not at all inconsistent in their minds with his real human existence; tradition, therefore, is not equally in favor of the two views, but stands on the side

of one of them, and nothing short of direct proof of the inconsistency of this view could lead to a decision in favor of the other. Nor would it be sufficient to prove, granted that it could be proved, that it is impossible to reconstruct the lines of the personality of Jesus; if it were impossible, that would indicate the extreme scantiness of our historical knowledge about him, but not his non-existence. It would be necessary to prove at least that the historical existence of Jesus does not serve to explain the origins of Christianity — that is, that they are explained without it and are themselves sufficient to explain the creation of the myth of Jesus. Not one of these points has been proved by the radical critics. The analysis of the sources is not so negative as they claim, because the sources are in accord on the fundamental points, while the theory of the pseudepigraphical character and extreme lateness (second century) of the Pauline epistles appears untenable. The claim of radical criticism that the belief in the resurrection and divinity of Jesus could not have been derived from an actual human life rests on an a priori process of psychological reasoning which fails to take into account the religious disposition of the time, both in relation to Jewish apocalyptic and to hellenistic-oriental mysticism. The various religious elements of the environment in place and time that are used to form the "myth of Christ" are in great part real and of value, and they do not exclude, but on the contrary formally require, the existence of a real being as the centre of their crystallization. For this there are three reasons: (1) The origins of Christianity, as they are described in the sources, necessarily presuppose an initial event which must have taken place during the first decades of our era, and this, according to the actual contents of the sources, we cannot identify except in the messianic movement originated by Jesus. In an inadmissible manner the radical critics ignore, or misrepresent, the eschatological movement of early Christianity. (2) The position in history which the tradition assigns to Jesus is chronologically very near to the tradition itself, and is too fixed and definite, in contrast to the vagueness of the mystery myths, to be explained as a mythical creation. (3) The explanations, attempted by Drews and Smith, of how the myth-

ical Jesus became an historical figure, are entirely inadequate. Over against the line of descent which they postulate stands the actual line of ascent from the Synoptics to John, and even earlier from Mark to the early chapters of Matthew and Luke, not to speak of the subsequent development of christological dogma. Moreover, the existence of ebionism, that is, of a Christian church in Palestine which believed in Jesus the man, is a fundamental point.

Although the conclusions of this radical criticism cannot be accepted, it yet represents an important, even an indispensable, episode in the elaboration of the history of primitive Christianity. The mythical-mystical theory was one of the two extreme reactions against the spiritualistic and moralistic idealizations of the origins of Christianity; the other was the all-comprehensive eschatological theory of Schweitzer, though this was less unhistorical than the radical theory. As Schweitzer's contention has to its credit that it brought the eschatological element in Christian origins clearly into view, so the radical denials have given the element of mystery a secure place. This latter had indeed already been given prominence by the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule' without the arbitrary destruction and construction of the mythologist, but the school met with such opposition that it is doubtful if it would have made any headway without the destructive charge of the volunteer advance-guard of mythologists. From the *mêlée* the latter did not emerge victorious, but the position of the liberal Protestants was certainly demolished, and the final victory was with the 'Religionsgeschichtliche.'

That this is so can be seen from the productive activity in historical theology immediately before the War and still more since 1918. In a survey written by Johannes Weiss in 1913 of the opinions held about the problem of Christian origins,¹⁵⁸ he admits that the elements of primitive Christian christology are to be found in the syncretistic religions, though he insists, and rightly, on the necessity of determining the exact religious

¹⁵⁸ 'Das Problem der Entstehung des Christentums,' in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1913, pp. 423-515.

process which brought about the application of these elements to Jesus. He even asked whether the development of Christianity in the direction of mystery ought not to be placed earlier than Paul, although he afterward decided against the suggestion and treated as secondary everything in pre-pauline Christianity not derived from the influence of the personality of Jesus, which he deemed supreme even in its influence on Paul's thought. In Johannes Weiss's "Urchristentum," left unfinished at his death in 1914,¹⁵⁹ he went more into detail, rejecting Maurenbrecher's theory of the application to Jesus of a pre-existing eschatological dogma, and pronouncing equally improbable any borrowing from the mysteries.¹⁶⁰ He admitted, however, the *Anthropos* of Paul to be a hellenized form of the Son of Man, accepting the myth of the proto-man as reconstructed by Bousset and Reitzenstein, and emphasized the realistic interpretation of the sacramentalism of Paul. In a word, the new trend of thought had influenced him, almost in spite of himself.

At the same time, Bousset, in his "Kyrios Christos,"¹⁶¹ set forth the history of belief in Jesus in early Christian times, making a sharp distinction between the hellenistic Christianity of Paul (faith in the Lord Jesus, present divinity), the Christianity of Palestine (faith in the Son of Man, transcendental Messiah), and the consciousness of Jesus himself. Much might be said regarding these sharp distinctions and the psychological difficulty he finds in imagining in Jesus a consciousness that he was the Son of Man; but Bousset's presentation of the christological development in close connection with the religious conditions of the time was extremely interesting, and the polemic against Wernle, in a supplementary book¹⁶² in defence of the

¹⁵⁹ *Das Urchristentum*. The first part was published in 1913, the second and final part (completed by R. Knopf, so far as possible from other works of Weiss) in 1917. We use here only the part prepared by Weiss himself.

¹⁶⁰ As a matter of fact, it was not a question of mechanical application or borrowing. Theological objections to the theories of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule' are often based on an inability to understand them in their vital concreteness.

¹⁶¹ *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (1913; 2nd ed., posthumous, 1921).

¹⁶² *Jesus der Herr: Nachträge und Auseinandersetzungen zu Kyrios Christos* (1916).

mystical-sacramental interpretation of Paulinism, gave a more decidedly progressive character to Bousset's work as a whole.

Classical philologists continued their interest in the origins of Christianity. Paul Wendland (1864-1915) elucidated the relation of hellenistic-roman culture to early Christianity,¹⁶³ and Eduard Norden (1868-) boldly approached the problem of a capital text of the New Testament, Paul's speech at Athens, which he held to be unauthentic and late. His theory of hellenistic sources for the speech¹⁶⁴ was not convincing, but it gave him opportunity to explain the hellenistic, gnostic, religious idea of the Unknown God, as well as to make important contributions to the literary criticism of Acts.¹⁶⁵ The value of a systematic exposition of the hellenistic setting of early Christianity from philological and archaeological data was shown by Hans Böhlig in a study of the state of religion at Tarsus,¹⁶⁶ in which, after speaking of religion, the god Sandan, and the mysteries, he passes on to deal with philosophy.

On the eve of the War Alfred Loisy, by that time professor in the Collège de France, wrote a general treatise, both analytical and synthetic, on "*Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien*" (not published until 1919), in which, with his accustomed lucidity and logic, he discussed the mysteric element in early Christianity, limiting the inquiry to Paul or at least to hellenistic Christianity. In this book he gave equal weight to the connection of the Christian mystery with other mysteries and to Christianity's own originality. He thereby sanctioned an exaggerated opposition between the Jewish eschatological and the hellenistic mysteric phases of early Christianity, making a twofold division in place of Bousset's threefold division, but this very exaggeration lent greater clearness to his statement of the problem of the Christian mystery.

¹⁶³ *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (1907; 2nd ed., 1912).

¹⁶⁴ *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (1913).

¹⁶⁵ He attributes to Luke the original compilation of Acts, but thinks that our text represents a radical revision. Loisy has accepted this theory (*Les Actes des Apôtres*, 1920) and has extended it to the Gospel of Luke (*L'Évangile de Luc*, 1924).

¹⁶⁶ *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsus im augusteischen Zeitalter mit Berücksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften* (1913).

The same sharp distinction between the Jewish eschatological phase and the phase of hellenistic mystery in the origins of Christianity is made in George Foot Moore's (1851-) full treatment of early Christianity in the second volume of his "History of Religions" (1916), one of the very few general histories of religion that give Christianity an adequate place. Moore emphasizes the dependence of Paul on earlier hellenistic Christianity, and makes a distinction, which deserves careful attention, between the more personal element in Paul's theology (consisting of his conception of justification by faith) and his mystical sacramentalism and belief in a divine being who descended to earth to die and rise again — both elements standing in close relation to his religious environment, not only Christian but pagan. The character of a mystery assumed by Christianity is clearly recognized, but the distinguishing characteristics of the Christian mystery are rightly pointed out. The doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is described as an 'intellectual mystery,' and placed in its relation to hellenistic literature and extra-christian gnosticism. Finally, a point not generally noticed is brought out — the variety of religious types and tendencies within Christianity itself in the last quarter of the first century.

§ 9. 'FORMGESCHICHTE'; REITZENSTEIN

In the resumption of studies after the War, we find a renewal of literary criticism of the Synoptics, but not in the old form and spirit. The theory of two sources, Mark and the second source, being now established, there remained the task of analyzing these sources. Previous study of this topic had aimed to discover the traces of earlier revisions and combinations which produced our gospels. The scanty results and the extremely hypothetical character of these attempts¹⁶⁷ caused scholars to try a new path, already used for the Old Testament by Gunkel and his followers. The attempt was made to distinguish and characterize the several elements composing the texts according to their 'form,' or literary type — moral or religious ex-

¹⁶⁷ On these attempts see the first volume of Goguel's Introduction cited above (p. 335, note 142).

ample, apothegm, tale, legend, myth, sententious saying, debate, comparison, parable. The negative part of the work, which consisted in proving that the links of connection between the several elements of the Synoptic tradition are artificial, was done by K. L. Schmidt (1891-), in "Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu" (1919), the positive by Martin Dibelius (1883-) in "Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums" (1919) and Rudolf Bultmann (1884-), in "Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition" (1921). The 'formgeschichtliche Schule' tried to explain the origin and character of these various types of the Synoptic elements, and their history before they were incorporated into our gospels, from the life of the early Christian church, the needs of its preaching and worship, the suggestion of its religious experiences, and the interests and controversies of believers. Thus the literary history of the Synoptics became a religious and social history of early Christianity, or at least established the close connection between the two. In this, the more interesting but less developed aspect of its work, this school has taken up its new, more strictly and intensively historical inquiries, but in determining the successive 'forms' assumed by the tradition, and in establishing standards for testing historical trustworthiness, the accomplishment of these writers is less satisfactory. A development of the 'formal-historical school' ¹⁶⁸ in this direction of the history of religion is to be seen in the work of G. Bertram (1896-), "Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuscult" (1922), which is expressly connected with the 'formal' school by its sub-title, "eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung." Bertram undertakes to treat the story of the passion as a cult-legend, taking the term 'cult' (as had already been done by Bultmann) in a rather

¹⁶⁸ To this school belong the works of M. Albertz, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1922), 'Zur Formengeschichte der Auferstehungsberichte' (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1922). A continuation and in part a correction of this last study is L. Brun, *Die Auferstehung Christi in der urchristlichen Ueberlieferung* (1925). For critical discussion of the school, see E. Fascher, *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (1924); M. Goguel, 'Une nouvelle école de critique évangélique: la "form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Schule"' (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1926, pp. 114-160); L. Köhler, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments* (1927). All three of these writers undertake to show that this method is inadequate from the point of view of historical criticism.

wide sense as substantially equivalent to 'religious experience or belief.' In a more restricted sense, Loisy has recently proposed to consider the Synoptics as actual liturgical texts, and he thinks he finds the proof of this in their style and in a certain rhythmical structure.¹⁶⁹ K. L. Schmidt, in "Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte" (1923),¹⁷⁰ very positively asserts that the Synoptics, though not possessing this liturgical character, are at least the expression of a religious movement. Literary criticism and the use of data from the history of religion here approach one another, and we may hope that the new 'Formgeschichte' will avoid the error in which the earlier school of literary criticism lost itself, namely that of becoming an end in itself and a field for literary *tours de force*.

In the investigation of Christian origins by the aid of the history of religion, Reitzenstein stands to-day in the front line, with a whole series of publications to his credit. They are tiresome to read, for they lack clearness of arrangement and lucid synthesis and are full of excursus in which texts and exegesis are mixed together, but they contain a wealth of material and of suggestive comparison, and above all they everywhere show a subtle sense of the religious value of words and representations. Fragmentary and conglomerate as they are, these publications have a single theme: the reconstruction of the myth of primitive man, or the Human Soul, a celestial being who descended to earth, was imprisoned in matter, and is liberated (redeemed) and liberates (redeems) individuals, together with the search for the connections of this myth with belief in the end of the world and its renewal and in the final resurrection. The theme is still that of the two fundamental elements in primitive Christianity, mystery (individual, mystic, present, or ever renewed) and eschatology (collective, moral, future, and final); Reitzenstein's investigations are only another attempt

¹⁶⁹ See page 23 of his *L'Évangile de Luc* (1924), where he gives a bibliography of his own works on this subject.

¹⁷⁰ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments Hermann Gunkel dargebracht (1923), II, pp. 50 ff.

to reconstruct the historical religious origins of Christianity.¹⁷¹ The materials with which he operates, with continual, many-sided comparisons and a certain venturesomeness in finding likenesses and drawing conclusions, are (1) the literature of later Judaism, both Jewish and Judaeo-hellenistic; (2) early Christian literature, including both the New Testament and other writings; (3) the hellenistic religious literature already referred to; (4) Mandaean literature; (5) Manichaean literature. The chief novelties come from these last two literatures, for Reitzenstein has fully exploited the Mandaean texts published by Mark Lidzbarski¹⁷² and the numerous, though scattered and fragmentary, publications of new Manichaean texts found in the Far East,¹⁷³ besides unpublished material. The principal result which he considers himself to have attained is the reconstruction of an "Iranian mystery of redemption," a religious belief and cult centring about the above-mentioned myth, which was professed several centuries before Christ in the Iranian-zarathustrian world, if not in the official religion of Zarathustra, and which thence penetrated into the Jewish world and gave rise to the Mandaean sect. By this oriental-jewish, or more exactly Iranian-jewish, gnosticism, the origin of the Christian religious movement is at least in part to be explained. Reitzenstein does not in the slightest degree cast doubt on the real existence of Jesus, nor mean to undervalue the originality of the religious thought of either Jesus or Paul. Much of all this is provisional and uncertain, as the author himself recognizes, and we might add, much of it is one-sided; but the elements

¹⁷¹ 'Die Göttin Psyche in der hellenistischen und frühchristlichen Literatur' (Sitzungsberichte, Heidelberg Academy, 1917); 'Das Mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung' (ibid., 1919); 'Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium' (1921); 'Iranischer Erlösungsglaube' (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1921, pp. 1 ff.); 'Gedanken zur Entwicklung des Erlösungsglaubens' (Historische Zeitschrift, 1922, pp. 1 ff.; an attempt to give a synthetic exposition); Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland (1926; in collaboration with H. G. Schaeder); Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (3rd ed., 1927); 'Zur Mandäerfrage' (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1927, pp. 39 ff.).

¹⁷² Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer (1915); Mandäische Liturgien (Abhandlungen, Göttingen Academy, 1920); Ginza (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte, 1925, published by the Göttingen Academy).

¹⁷³ For a comprehensive review of these documents see P. Alfarc, Les écritures manichéennes (2 vols., 1920).

that he introduces from comparative history and the character of concreteness that these give to the religious history of early Christianity make his work undeniably a valuable preliminary foundation.¹⁷⁴

Even those who do not fully accept Reitzenstein's reconstruction, often admit the antiquity of Mandaeanism, its origin in Palestine, and its connection with the movement of John the Baptist (who has a place of honor in Mandaean beliefs), and with the baptist gnostic sects that sprang up at about the beginning of our era in the outskirts of the Jewish world.¹⁷⁵ Although Reitzenstein's audacious hypothesis that the Synoptic apocalypse is descended from a Mandaean text has not been favorably regarded, yet the strong and far-reaching affinities between the theology of the Fourth Gospel and Mandaean gnosis¹⁷⁶ and between the mythology of Revelation and Mandaean writings have received full recognition.¹⁷⁷ Now if, on the one hand, a connection of the Baptist's movement with Mandaeanism is admitted, and on the other, due attention is paid to the controversial element against his movement which is found in the Fourth Gospel, as Baldensperger had already

¹⁷⁴ A keen and impartial criticism of all Reitzenstein's publications through 1921 is given by Gressmann, 'Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion' (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1922, pp. 154 ff.).

¹⁷⁵ A Catholic scholar, Père M.-J. Lagrange, in 'La gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangélique' (Revue Biblique, 1927, pp. 321 ff.), accepts the Palestinian origin of Mandaeanism and its possible chronological priority to the ministry of Jesus, although later he would consider it as dependent on Christianity, not vice versa, and does not even admit its connection with John the Baptist. Opinions against this view and against the Western origin of Mandaeanism have been expressed by E. Peterson, 'Bemerkungen zur mandäischen Literatur,' and F. Büchsel, 'Mandäer und Johannesjünger' (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1926, pp. 236 ff.; 1927, pp. 219 ff.). Both Reitzenstein in the article cited, 'Zur Mandäerfrage,' and Lidzbarski, 'Mandäische Fragen' (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1927, pp. 70 ff.), have replied to Peterson.

¹⁷⁶ R. Bultmann, 'Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums' (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1925, pp. 100 ff.); 'Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium' (Gunkel Festschrift, 1923, II, pp. 1 ff.); Walter Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, 2nd ed., 1925 (in Lietzmann's Handbuch zum Neuen Testament). Lagrange's study mentioned above is largely a refutation of Bultmann and Bauer.

¹⁷⁷ See the commentary on Revelation by E. Lohmeyer (1926) in Lietzmann's Handbuch.

noticed, it cannot be denied that we have here the evidence of a conflict between Christian-johannine gnosticism and baptistic-mandaean gnosticism, a fact of primary importance for the history of Christian origins. At the same time the Fourth Gospel would thus be definitively transferred from the sphere of Jewish-alexandrian philosophy to that of an oriental-gnostic, mysteric current of religious thought,¹⁷⁸ confirming the recent theory of C. F. Burney ("The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel," 1922) and of C. C. Torrey (Harvard Theological Review, XVI, 1923, pp. 305-344) that our Greek gospel is a translation from the Aramaic.

One secure result of these still unfinished researches is the final overthrow, suggested above, of the antithesis between the Jewish and the Greek (or rather hellenistic) interpretation of Christian origins, since both the Jewish and the hellenistic currents must be traced back, side by side, to an oriental-hellenistic gnosticism. So we have an Old Testament theologian and historian, Rudolf Kittel,¹⁷⁹ and a classical philologist, E. Norden,¹⁸⁰ both studying by the same methods, and with the same results, the same materials, the theme of the heavenly son and redeemer, the one in Judaism (or rather directly in the Old Testament), the other in the hellenistic-roman world. We may however question whether it is not going too far to try to push back into Hebrew religion and the oriental world this myth and this mystery, which — unless we are willing to deny the validity of history and rest content with primitive esoteric philosophical beliefs — must remain the characteristic product of the religious individualism of the hellenistic age.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ H. G. Schaeder, *Der 'Mensch' im Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums*, pp. 306 ff. (in collaboration with Reitzenstein), thinks it possible to reconstruct a Mandaean prototype of the prologue of John, in which Enosh was mentioned. He accepts the theory of an Aramaic original of the Fourth Gospel.

¹⁷⁹ *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen und das Alte Testament* (1924).

¹⁸⁰ *Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee* (1924).

¹⁸¹ A reaction against the excessive antiquity attributed to Jewish eschatology — eschatology and mystery being combined in the myth of the Redeemer — is marked by a short essay by G. Hölscher, *Der Ursprung der jüdischen Eschatologie* (1925), and by a treatise of A. Freiherr von Gall, *Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ: eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur vorchristlichen Eschatologie* (1926), which contains a wealth of material.

An Italian scholar, Adolfo Omodeo, in his "Prolegomeni alla storia dell' età apostolica" (1921), and in "Paolo di Tarso apostolo delle genti" (1922),¹⁸² remains, like Schweitzer, too much engaged with the opposition of Hellenism and Judaism. Not that he ignores or excludes the penetration of hellenistic and oriental elements into Judaism, but he believes that Judaism, so far as concerns its relation to Christianity, must be taken as a homogeneous whole in which those elements have been so fully incorporated as to be indistinguishable from the rest. The facts, on the contrary, would seem to reveal a fluid mass, with a number of different currents always in motion and actually in process of formation at the time when Christianity arose. Omodeo has the merit, however, of emphasizing effectively the connection of paulinism with later Jewish apocalyptic, and also the eschatological-social element in paulinism itself.

With the political end of the Jewish nation and the absolute dominance of rabbinical orthodoxy, the fluid mass of Judaism of the hellenistic and earlier Roman period became a solid rock. This is the reason why the studies of rabbinical Judaism, both Mishna and Talmud, in relation to the New Testament, which have been so numerous in recent years, have not thrown so much light on the origins of Christianity as has sometimes been expected.¹⁸³ G. F. Moore's latest work, "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Religion of the Tannaim" (2 vols., 1927), is the most complete and most trustworthy exposition ever made of orthodox Judaism as represented and codified in the Tannaite literature. This Judaism

Both these writers find the beginning of the eschatology in Second Isaiah, but while Hölischer considers it an 'Eigenbesitz' of Isaiah, Freiherr von Gall rightly admits a profound and continuous Iranian influence. He also accepts Reitzenstein's theory of a Zarathustrian Jewish gnosticism.

¹⁸² These two volumes, with an earlier one, *Gesù* (1913; 2nd ed., 1926), form a 'History of Christian Origins.' In *Gesù il Nazoreo* (1927), a biographical portrait in a series called *Maestri dell' Azione*, Omodeo has taken up again the conclusions reached in the first of these volumes and modified them so as to bring them into a more definite relation to the history of religion (connection of Jesus with John the Baptist; a Nazarene community).

¹⁸³ An extensive rabbinical commentary on the New Testament is H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols., 1922-1928). We may mention also the collections made by Fiebig, particularly *Jesu Bergpredigt: rabbinische Texte* (1926).

ignored or rejected the apocalypses and cosmogonies, rejected every dualistic tendency, did not develop the conception of divine intermediaries, and shows no trace of a preëxistent, or divine, or suffering Messiah. But it can hardly be supposed that this form of Judaism represents all the Judaism of Palestine in the time of Jesus, not to speak of hellenistic Judaism,¹⁸⁴ which does not come in question.

The opposition of the two elements, Jewish and hellenistic, in the form which we have seen to be now discredited, is found again in a study by Gillis P:son Wetter,¹⁸⁵ devoted to the conception, which he considers hellenistic, of Son of God as meaning a divine being sent from heaven to earth as prophet and apostle (Simon Magus, Apollonius of Tyana, the prophets referred to by Celsus), a conception which he uses especially to illustrate the representation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. But since he finally assigns an oriental origin to this conception and postulates a pre-christian, Syro-palestinian combination of it with the idea of the Messiah, he himself annuls that opposition of elements which he admitted in the beginning. The opposition is again definitely affirmed by Hans Leisegang (1890-)¹⁸⁶ in his "Pneuma Hagion" (1922), who would derive the representations of the Holy Spirit in the Synoptics, Acts, and Paul (virgin birth, baptism by fire spoken of by John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, the descent and gifts of the Holy Spirit) from hellenistic mysticism, meaning thereby Greek as opposed not only to Jewish but also to oriental mysticism. This is a position which, in view of what has been told above of the history of these studies, may be called reactionary, for it is based on an identification of 'hellenistic' and 'Greek,' which, at least

¹⁸⁴ There is perhaps a slight tendency in this direction in Moore, although he keeps very strictly to the subject in hand. On the other hand A. Marmorstein, 'Iranische und jüdische Religion' (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1927, pp. 231ff.), goes much too far, when, from statements similar to those of Moore as to the supposed divine intermediaries in rabbinical literature, he does not hesitate to deny entirely any substantial Iranian influence on Judaism — an influence which Moore fully recognizes.

¹⁸⁵ *Der Sohn Gottes: eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums* (1916).

¹⁸⁶ *Pneuma Hagion: der Ursprung des Geistesbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik* (1922).

in the field of religion, is wholly arbitrary.¹⁸⁷ Leisegang has crowned his error in a small book, "Die Gnosis" (1924), where he rehearses Harnack's interpretation of gnosticism as Greek intellectualism, though not as a mere internal crisis in Christianity (Leisegang, however, deals specifically only with the well-known gnostic 'heretics,' from Simon Magus to the Pistis Sophia). Between these two books he had tried to explain Paul from the peculiar system of the Apostle's mental processes ("Der Apostel Paulus als Denker," 1923), with open disdain for previous comparative historical study.

Quite different is the Greek theory propounded by Vittorio Macchioro in "Orfismo e paolinismo" (1922),¹⁸⁸ for although he sets off Judaism against hellenism and sees little distinction between 'Greek' and 'hellenistic,' yet he fully accepts the comparative historical method and shows a concrete idea of the religious spirit of hellenism and of the mysteries. These qualities, to which he adds also a thorough knowledge of philology and archaeology, make this work and his other similar writings¹⁸⁹ valuable contributions to these studies, but his theory of the orphic origin of paulinism is altogether unacceptable, for reasons relating both to Paul and to the conditions of his time and environment, not to mention the fact that to concentrate in Paul alone, as Macchioro does, the whole elaboration of Christianity in the direction of a mystery is wholly unhistorical.

Apart from research in comparative history, but with no hostility to it, stands Ernesto Buonaiuti.¹⁹⁰ His earlier eschatological views have been somewhat modified in favor of the

¹⁸⁷ The Greek character of the hellenistic mysteries is emphasized also by U. Fracassini, *Il misticismo greco e il cristianesimo* (1922), which deals primarily with the difference between the two.

¹⁸⁸ Four essays on orphism, of which the most important for us is the first, 'L'origine orfica della cristologia paolina.'

¹⁸⁹ See especially *Zagreus: Studi sul orfismo* (1920).

¹⁹⁰ *L'essenza del cristianesimo* (1922); *Gesù il Cristo* (1926); *San Paolo* (1925), these last two in the series 'Profili' of Formiggini; *Saggi sul cristianesimo primitivo* (1923). It is well to bear in mind that in these last years Buonaiuti's studies on primitive Christianity have been from the point of view of the philosophy of religion rather than from that of purely historical research.

moral interpretation of the message of Jesus, but his primary interest is still in the action of this moral content upon the associated life of the early Christians. This religious-social element he tries to trace back to the teaching of Jesus and to follow in its manifestations in the whole life of primitive Christianity, and especially in the resulting opposition of the Christian social and moral ideals to those of the civil and political society of the times. His moral interpretation of the Christian message is — to use his own favorite phrase — from the point of view of “*etica associata*” (group ethics), and thus it differs widely from the individualistic spiritualism advocated by Harnack’s school.

Harnack has not changed his views on this question,¹⁹¹ which were shared by the late Karl Holl (1866–1926),¹⁹² but some other liberal Protestant theologians, such as Weinel, show more adaptability. The latter, in the third edition (1921) of his “*Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*,” although he repeats the usual interpretation of the kingdom as both present and future, and calls Jesus a prophet, not an apocalypticist (feeling, apparently, that the second designation would be wanting in respect), and though he gives the spiritual and moral interpretation of the teaching of Jesus, yet admits that Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of Man in the sense of the transcendental Messiah, and accepts the realistic mysticism of Paul and the influence of hellenistic mysticism upon him.¹⁹³ In dealing with the thought of Paul he attempts, without complete success, to break up the old scheme of *loci theologici* and to attain the concreteness of a development in the history of religion.

¹⁹¹ *Die Entstehung der christlichen Theologie und des kirchlichen Dogmas* (1927), six lectures, in which Harnack again declares war against the ‘*religionsgeschichtliche Schule*,’ and again emphasizes the lateness of the influence of hellenistic mystery religions on Christianity.

¹⁹² ‘*Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu der Urgemeinde*’ (1921); *Urchristentum und Religionsgeschichte* (1924); *Reformation und Urchristentum* (1924). The first two are published also in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, II, pp. 1 ff. To the second essay Reitzenstein has replied in *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus*, pp. 174 ff. The third title is a short address.

¹⁹³ On these points, compare the second edition (1915) of his *Paulus*. On the negative side, on the whole, are K. Deissner, *Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit* (2nd ed., 1921), and P. Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (4th ed., 1922), the latter representing conservative Protestant theology.

The greatest opposition to the new ideas is naturally found in the interpretation of Jesus, and it is strange to find an extremely 'modern' critic like Bultmann — the Bultmann of the 'formgeschichtliche Schule' and of Johannine Mandaeism — giving an account of the teaching of Jesus,¹⁹⁴ keen and forceful, in which on the one hand he makes no mention of the events of his career or of his messianic self-consciousness (anti-historical omissions that are significant) and on the other hand does not pass, as we should expect him to do, from his distinctly and emphatically transcendental interpretation of the kingdom to the consideration of the historical setting which was the real background of the beliefs, aspirations, and attitudes toward life of Jesus and his followers. Everything is reduced to a formal and abstract decision ("entweder . . . oder," as he monotonously repeats) for or against the kingdom of God as the only reality of the message of the gospel. This is Kant's categorical imperative transferred to the origins of the Christian movement.

Bultmann might call to his defence the eminent secular historian Eduard Meyer (1855—), who, in his "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums" (II, p. 431) speaks of the "ethical rigorism of Kant" in connection with the ethics of Jesus. In the three volumes of this important and original work¹⁹⁵ Meyer deals fully with the history of Jesus and of early Christianity through the New Testament period, and has given a critical analysis of the sources of the New Testament. His attitude toward these is decidedly and summarily conservative, both for Acts, which he considers a work entirely from the hand of Luke, and for Mark, in which he is quite sure that he finds a 'Jüngerquelle' coming from Peter, and a 'Zwölferquelle' giving the Jerusalem tradition as it developed after Peter had left Jerusalem. The works of Norden and Loisy and of the 'formgeschichtliche Schule' have made little impression on Meyer. At times, however, he swings from extreme conservatism to hypercriticism, as when he postulates

¹⁹⁴ Jesus (1926), in the series *Die Unsterblichen*.

¹⁹⁵ Vol. I, *Die Evangelien* (1921; 4th ed., 1924); vol. II, *Die Entwicklung des Judentums und Jesus von Nazareth* (1921; 4th ed., 1925); vol. III, *Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums* (1923).

a complete, or nearly complete, separation between Jesus and John the Baptist (it is hard to believe that John can have known nothing of Jesus), or when he denies all credibility to the episode of the disciples of John at Ephesus (Acts 19). Meyer is absolutely opposed to the new importance assigned in the last twenty years to the movement of John the Baptist as the antecedent of Christianity, although at a later period he assumes a great influence exercised by the Baptist's followers on the Christian church at Jerusalem (baptism, fasting, common prayer). Naturally, he denies the connection between John's followers and Mandaeanism, and rejects the position of the latter in the history of religion which is affirmed by the comparative school. More generally, he denies the existence of a gnostic and mysteric syncretism in the hellenistic-oriental world before Christianity; the antecedents of Christianity are to be found only in Judaism. Judaism had, indeed, been influenced by the religion of Persia, but at the beginning of our era, as Meyer conceives it, it had fully assimilated all foreign elements and formed a close and homogeneous religious whole, even essenism being purely Jewish. Judaism and Christianity, through their influence on the syncretism of the imperial age, produced the gnostic movement which came into being as the result of the personal work of Simon Magus. The question of the connection between Paul and hellenism is put in the old form, as a connection with Greek philosophy, and from this point of view is very properly answered in the negative. The only external influences that affected Paul were rabbinism and Jewish eschatology; even Bousset's *Kyrios Christos* is completely ignored, but at the same time Meyer declares that the 'Anthropos' of Paul has nothing to do with the Jewish Son of Man. The Christian conception of salvation (*soteria*) has its roots only in the Old Testament, hence is purely Jewish, not hellenistic.¹⁹⁶ Of Jesus and the kingdom of God he naturally takes the liberal Protestant view, accepting also Harnack's idea that the messianic consciousness of Jesus was an outgrowth of his experience of the

¹⁹⁶ This is said on page 393 of volume III, but later (p. 397) he declares, in manifest contradiction, that the term 'soter' for Christ made its way slowly into Christianity, and became habitual only in the second century.

fatherhood of God. He makes Jesus believe in the eschatology of the pharisees (this term being used, perhaps, to exclude apocalyptic properly so called), and in the imminence of the kingdom, and does not observe that the subjective character he assigns to the kingdom practically forbids an eschatology of that kind. On Jesus' consciousness that he is the Messiah of Daniel, Meyer is not definite, but he repeats that Jesus preferred the title Son of Man because of its ambiguity.

Opposed to this conservative survival¹⁹⁷ represented in an extreme form by the eminent historian, stands the negative position of a new radical school. The leading part in this is now taken, not by the German, Drews, but by a Frenchman, P.-L. Couchoud. His "*Le Mystère de Jésus*" (1924) made an impression in the Latin world but little inferior to that produced among Germans by Drews's *Christusmythe*. It is a short and brilliant essay, divested of almost all the comparative apparatus of Drews, in which the familiar arguments against the historical existence of Jesus are briefly and effectively sketched, without any substantial addition being made.¹⁹⁸ New material in this direction, if there is any, may be expected from the undertaking now in hand on the part of "Henri Delafosse" with reference to the epistles of Paul. Three small volumes of "*Les écrits de Saint-Paul*" have already appeared in the series "*Christianisme*" edited by Couchoud. "Delafosse" reduces the authentic portion of these letters to very short personal notes, which were incorporated in Marcionite theological compilations that received the name of Paul, and these compilations were in their turn worked over by a Catholic redactor. This is a radical view, but at the same time, from the point of view of the historian, completely reactionary, in that the author's main thesis is the old and discredited conception that gnosticism is a late and internal Christian phenomenon.

¹⁹⁷ 'Conservatism' that is to say, in historiography, not in religious views, or, at least primarily, in literary criticism.

¹⁹⁸ Couchoud's book stimulated Goguel to make a new and thorough study of the controversy over the historical existence of Jesus (*Jésus de Nazareth, mythe ou histoire?* 1925) and to a new and well-considered refutation of the mythological theory.

Drews, on his part, has continued his course, maintaining that the gospel of Mark does not contain a single line, or even a single word, that is historical, and giving it an astral interpretation.¹⁹⁹ In this connection he has developed his astral mythology,²⁰⁰ and has planned to go on to a general reconstruction (the fullest and most systematic so far attempted by the mythologists) of the manner in which Christianity was derived from gnosticism.²⁰¹ His idea is substantially that Christianity resulted from the combination of the transcendental Messiah of the apocalypses with a myth of solar origin (found in the pagan mystery religions) of a divine being, mediator and redeemer, who descended to earth to contend against the powers of darkness, died, and rose again; and from a further combination of this first fusion with the Servant of Jahveh of Second Isaiah, a figure which had itself already been combined with the "righteous man" of the Wisdom of Solomon. This double and quadruple combination we possess in what is known as paulinism, although that is derived only in part from the historic Paul, who was simpler and more Jewish than the epistles attributed to him. Paul does not yet know the historical Jesus; the transformation of the myth into history is the work of the evangelists, who about the year 100 sought to build up a defence against the antilegalistic and gnostic radicalism represented by the Minim, or Minaei, within Judaism itself.²⁰² Later came the Fourth Gospel, to raise again to the speculative plane the Christ now become historical. The interest of this most recent work of Drews lies in two points: first, by the systematic arrangement of his material and the complete use he makes of it he gives clear proof that the reconstruction of the origins of Christianity by radical mythology is a failure; secondly, by furnishing the most complete and organic picture of the ele-

¹⁹⁹ *Das Markusevangelium als Zeugnis gegen die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu* (1921).

²⁰⁰ *Der Sternhimmel in der Dichtung und Religion der alten Völker und des Christentums* (1923).

²⁰¹ *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Gnostizismus* (1924).

²⁰² For this interpretation of the heresy of the Minim, of whom we learn from rabbinical sources, Drews depends upon Friedländer, who discusses it at great length in his *Religiöse Bewegungen*. Previously the Minim had usually been identified with the Jewish Christians.

ments drawn from the religious history of the time he supplies valuable material which can be effectively used for explaining the true origin of Christianity. His work will be useful as a store-house of material for researches as to Christian origins, at least in the hands of those who are capable of discriminating between the parts that are trustworthy and those which are merely the product of the author's imagination.

If, at the end of this long road, we were to review and appraise the work already done by modern writers on the history of the origins of Christianity, and were to seek an adequate idea of what remains to be accomplished, it would be a long task. It will be enough to point out some of the principal problems suggested by the present state of this historical investigation.

(1) Are the constructive elements of early Christianity fairly described as eschatology and mystery?

(2) If so, what specific form did each of them take in Christianity?

(3) Does mystery form a constructive part of the Christianity of Paul, or of the hellenistic Christianity of Antioch, or of Jewish Christianity at Jerusalem, or does it go back even to Jesus himself?

(4) Are we to recognize the existence of several types of religion, or at least several tendencies, in Palestinian Christianity and in pre-pauline hellenistic Christianity? Did the hellenization of Christianity begin outside of Palestine or in Palestine itself? Were there other analogous forms beside, or in opposition to, pauline Christianity? Are the antecedents of Johannine theology to be found in Paul or is Johannine theology a parallel and independent formation?

(5) Are the christology of Paul, that of John, and those of Antioch and Jerusalem, new formations from previous disconnected elements, or are they applications to Jesus of pre-existing dogmatic patterns?

(6) What is the exact relation between the Son of Man of the Synoptists, that same figure in the Fourth Gospel, and the 'heavenly man' of Paul?

(7) What is the relation between these representations and the divinities of the mysteries?

(8) Does the combination of eschatology and mystery appear for the first time in Christianity or did it exist earlier? Can we speak of an apocalyptic mystery, and of a mysteric eschatology?

(9) What is the relation between the myth of Anthropos and the conception of the kingdom of God?

(10) If we recognize an affinity between Iranian religion and hellenistic mysteries, ought we to infer a direct influence of the former on the latter or conclude that there were intermediate forms?

(11) Did there exist in Judaism at the beginning of our era a variety of religious forms, and were some of them of a syncretistic character? Was this true of the Judaism of Palestine?

(12) What were the actual relations between Christianity and John the Baptist's movement, and between the latter and Mandaeanism?

Many other questions could be formulated and each one of them could be subdivided into several others. All further progress in the historical investigation of Christian origins must come from a careful and methodical formulation of questions, the classification of them in series, and the attempt to solve them one by one. Historical and religious studies on later Judaism and on hellenistic and oriental religions have brought to light a great deal of precious material, and have opened new views and made possible new hypotheses. What we need now more than anything else is a systematic inventory of this material and of the hypotheses; that would form the best preparation for the solution of the questions formulated above, and of many others.

INDEX

Only the more important references to the several writers are included in this Index.

- Alfaric, Prosper, 355
 Annet, Peter, 266
- Bahrdt, K. F., 280
 Baldensperger, W., 317, 335
 Bauer, Bruno, 296 f., 343 f.
 Bauer, Walter, 356
 Baumgarten, S. J., 272
 Baur, F. C., 292-296
 Bengel, J. A., 284
 Bertram, Georg, 353 f.
 Beyschlag, Willibald, 302 f.
 Billerbeck, Paul, 358
 Böhlig, Hans, 351
 Bousset, Wilhelm, 316, 331, 350 f.
 Bretschneider, K. T., 283
 Brückner, Martin, 328
 Büchsel, Friedrich, 356
 Bultmann, Rudolf, 353, 356, 362
 Buonaiuti, Ernesto, 342, 360 f.
 Burney, C. F., 357
- Charles, R. H., 316
 Chiappelli, Alessandro, 307 f.
 Chubb, Thomas, 265
 Clemen, Carl, 337
 Colani, Timothée, 317
 Couchoud, P.-L., 364
 Cumont, Franz, 329
- Dalman, Gustav, 318
 Deissmann, Adolf, 337
 Deissner, Kurt, 361
 "Delafosse, Henri," 364
 De Wette, W. M. L., 283
 Dibelius, Franz, 334
 Dibelius, Martin, 334 f., 353
 Dieterich, Albrecht, 325, 329
 Dölger, F. J., 333 f.
 Drews, Arthur, 347-349, 365 f.
 Dupuis, C. F., 343
- Eichhorn, J. G., 281-283
 Ernesti, J. A., 272
 Everling, Otto, 324
- Feine, Paul, 361
 Fiebig, Paul, 358
- Fracassini, Umberto, 360
 Friedländer, Moritz, 331 f.
- Gall, A. Freiherr von, 357
 Gieseler, J. K. L., 282
 Goguel, Maurice, 335, 337, 364
 Gressmann, Hugo, 331, 356
 Griesbach, J. J., 281, 284
 Grotius, Hugo, 270
 Gunkel, Hermann, 324, 325-327
- Harnack, Adolf von, 304-306, 308, 330, 335, 361
 Hase, Karl von, 302 f.
 Heitmüller, Wilhelm, 325
 Herder, J. G., 282 f.
 Hilgenfeld, Adolf, 316
 Hölscher, G., 357
 Holl, Karl, 361
 Holtzmann, H. J., 298-300, 308, 313-315
 Holtzmann, Oskar, 335 f.
 Hume, David, 266
- Kalthoff, Albert, 345
 Keim, Theodor, 300 f.
 Kittel, Rudolf, 357
- Labanca, Baldassare, 308
 Lachmann, Karl, 284, 291
 Lagrange, M.-J., 356
 Leisegang, Hans, 359 f.
 Lessing, G. E., 268, 281
 Lidzbarski, Mark, 355 f.
 Lietzmann, Hans, 318
 Lightfoot, John, 270
 Locke, John, 264 f.
 Lohmeyer, Ernst, 356
 Loisy, Alfred, 338-340, 351, 354
 Loman, A. D., 344
 Lüdemann, Hermann, 324
- Macchioro, Vittorio, 360
 Marmorstein, A., 359
 Maurenbrecher, Max, 333
 Meyer, Eduard, 362-364
 Michaelis, J. D., 272 f.
 Middleton, Conyers, 266
 Moore, George Foot, 352, 358 f.
 Morgan, Thomas, 265 f.

Naber, Samuel, 344
Norden, Eduard, 351, 357

Omodeo, Adolfo, 358

Paulus, H. E. G., 275-277
Peterson, Erik, 356
Pfleiderer, Otto, 315 f.
Pierson, Allard, 344

Reimarus, H. S., 268 f., 274
Reitzenstein, Richard, 328 f., 330, 341,
354-356, 361
Renan, Ernst, 309-313
Réville, Albert, 313
Réville, Jean, 313
Ritschl, Albrecht, 305
Robertson, J. M., 345 f.

Salvatorelli, Luigi, 332 f.
Schaeder, H. G., 357
Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 277-280, 283
Schmidt, Hans, 333 f.
Schmidt, J. E. C., 283
Schmidt, K. L., 353 f.
Schürer, Emil, 317
Schwartz, Eduard, 335
Schweitzer, Albert, 320-324, 340-342
Semler, J. S., 272-274, 284
Simon, Richard, 270 f.
Smith, W. B., 346 f.

Strack, H. L., 358
Strauss, D. F., 286-290, 301 f.

Teichmann, Ernst, 325
Tischendorf, Konstantin von, 284
Toland, John, 265 f.
Torrey, C. C., 357
Turretin, J. A., 271

Usener, Hermann, 325
Usteri, J. M., 283

Van Manen, W. C., 344 f.
Venturini, K. H., 280
Volkmar, Gustav, 317
Volney, C. F., 343
Voltaire, F. M. A. de, 266-268
Volz, Paul, 316

Weinel, Heinrich, 336 f., 361
Weiss, Bernhard, 303 f.
Weiss, Johannes, 317 f., 338, 349 f.
Weisse, C. H., 290-292
Weizsäcker, Karl von, 306 f.
Wellhausen, Julius, 318 f., 335
Wendland, Paul, 351
Wernle, Paul, 336, 337 f.
Wetter, G. P., 359
Wettstein, J. J., 271
Wilke, C. G., 291
Woolson, Thomas, 266
Wrede, William, 319 f., 322, 327

FATE AND FREE WILL IN THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHIES ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS

GEORGE FOOT MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

IN THE thirteenth book of his *Ancient History of the Jews*, Josephus relates (Ant. xiii. 1-5) the doings and fortunes of Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabaeus and after the death of Judas (161 B.C.) the leader of the rebellious Jews in their struggle with the Syrian rulers. In the sequel of Jonathan's embassies to Rome and Sparta, and not long before he fell into the hands of Tryphon and was put to death, we read (Ant. xiii. 5, 9):

About this time there were three philosophical schools (*αἱρέσεις*) among the Jews, which entertained different opinions about human affairs. One of them was called that of the Pharisees, one of the Sadducees, and the third of the Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are the work of fate (*εἰμαρμένη*), but that some things are in men's own power (*ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς*) to determine whether they shall come to pass or not occur. The class (*γένος*) of the Essenes declares fate ruler of all things, and that nothing happens to men that is not in accordance with its decision (*ψῆφος*). The Sadducees do away completely with fate, holding it to be nothing at all, and denying that human affairs take their outcome in accordance with it; but they put all things in our own power (*ἐφ' ἑμῶν αὐτοῖς*), so that we ourselves become the authors of the good things that befall us and receive the worse things in consequence of our lack of discretion.

For more particular information the reader is referred to what Josephus had written twenty years earlier in the second book of the *Jewish War*.¹

To the passage just quoted from Ant. xiii. 5, 9 we shall return at a later point in our inquiry, but it is appropriate here to make some observations upon it.

In the first place it is to be remarked that the paragraph has no connection with the preceding (Jonathan's letter to the Lacedaemonians and the reception of his overtures) nor with the following narrative (the plans and movements of Demetrius' generals); it serves only to apprise us that in the latter

¹ See below, p. 374.

days of Jonathan these three native philosophies,² which he elsewhere describes as very old (Ant. xviii. 1, 2, ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων), were in existence, and what their distinctive doctrines on this point were, but tells us nothing about their origin or history. In other words, it is a purely chronological notice.

Secondly, of the fatalism here attributed to the Essenes there is no other intimation, either in the corresponding descriptions of the three sects or in the incidental mention of the order or of individual Essenes; on the contrary, what is told of them and the words that are put in their mouths suggest no departure from the pattern of Jewish theism.³

Thirdly, when the Pharisees and Sadducees appear on the historical stage, under John Hyrcanus and his successors,⁴ it is as parties vying with each other for political ascendancy through their influence over the rulers; and the contentious issue was not fate and free will, but the regulations (νόμιμα) — partly interpretation and application of biblical laws, partly traditional complements to them — the authority of which was maintained by the Pharisees but denied by the Sadducees (Ant. xiii. 10, 6).⁵

The occasion for the introduction of the three older schools in Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 2–14 and in Ant. xviii. 1, 1 ff. is the rise of a new party which Josephus calls “the fourth philosophy.” After the deposition and banishment of Archelaus (6 A.D.) Augustus decided to incorporate his tetrarchy in the province of Syria, and sent out Quirinius to make a census in Syria (including Judaea) for purposes of taxation, and to take possession of the property of Archelaus.⁶ Coponius accompanied him, under appointment as procurator of Judaea.⁷ The Jews did not take kindly to these measures, but were dissuaded from overt op-

² In the brief account of Jonathan's times in the War (Bell. Jud. i. 2, 1) there is no corresponding mention of these parties or sects.

³ See especially Ant. xviii. 1, 5, § 18: Ἑσσηνοῖς δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν θεῷ καταλείπειν φιλεῖ τὰ πάντα ὁ λόγος.

⁴ Ant. xiii. 10, 5 ff.

⁵ Again with a reference to Bell. Jud. ii.

⁶ Ant. xvii. 13, 5; xviii. 1, 1 and 6.

⁷ With powers, including that of capital punishment, not ordinarily conferred on procurators.

position by the high priest Joazar son of Boethus. A certain Judas (sometimes called a Galilean,⁸ sometimes a Gaulanite from the city of Gamala⁹), however, incited to revolt, saying that the census of property was nothing but plain servitude, and urging the people to assert their independence. This party made a religious principle of their political theory, holding that God was the sole ruler and sovereign, while tribute to the Romans was a recognition of mortal sovereigns besides God; they endured every torture rather than call any man sovereign, and encouraged their partisans by the assurance that the Deity would help only those who did their best to help themselves.¹⁰ They were a party of action, and in this unlike all the others.¹¹

Judas associated with himself a certain Sadducus, a Pharisee, and his party are said in all respects except their political intransigence to have agreed with the Pharisees.¹²

Josephus sees in this "new philosophy" the root of all the evils which befell the Jews from that time on, of which he gives a doleful catalogue, culminating in the burning of the temple (Ant. xviii. 1, 1). But though the movement had popular success (ibid.), we learn nothing of serious hostilities at the time¹³ and of anything like a formidable rising only a half century later, when the procurator, Gessius Florus, by his abuse of power, as with malice aforethought provoked the people into revolt (Ant. xviii. 1, 6; cf. xx. 11, 1).¹⁴

⁸ Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 1; ii. 17, 8; Ant. xx. 5, 2.

⁹ Ant. xviii. 1, 1.

¹⁰ Ant. xviii. 1, 1.

¹¹ Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 1.

¹² Ant. xviii. 1, 1; xviii. 1, 6.

¹³ It is common to find a name for the adherents of the "Fourth Philosophy" in the "Zealots," who play such an active part in Josephus' account of the siege of Jerusalem. It should be observed, however, that Josephus makes no such identification, either where he is recounting all the evils which sprang from the new philosophy of Judas Galilaeus (Ant. xviii. 1, 1), or where he is relating the doings of the Zealots in Jerusalem (Bell. Jud. iv. 3 ff.). The name first occurs in Bell. Jud. iv. 3, 9, as that which the faction gave themselves, *ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν*, not (as in reality) *ζηλωσάντες τὰ κάκιστα* — Josephus calls them 'robbers.' The typical zealots of the Old Testament history in Jewish apprehension were Phineas (Num. 25) and Elijah, and in taking this name to themselves the Zealots probably had these examples in mind. Simon the Zealot among the apostles of Jesus (Luke 6, 15; Acts 1, 13), for which Matthew and Mark in their lists have *ὁ Καναναῖος*, there is no occasion to discuss here.

¹⁴ A son of this Judas, named Menahem, was active in the beginning of the insurrection under Gessius Florus (Bell. Jud. ii. 17, 8-10); two other sons were crucified by Tiberius Alexander (Ant. xx. 5, 2).

The passage in the Jewish War (ii. 8) to which Josephus refers in several places begins with Judas the Galilean and his principles about paying taxes to the Romans:¹⁵

For three species of philosophy are current among Jews. The adherents of one school are Pharisees, of another, Sadducees, while the third, which thinks good to cultivate an ascetic piety, are called Essenes, though by race they are Jews.

Then follows (ii. 8, 2-13) a long description of the Essene coenobite order with its rule and discipline, supplemented by a short notice of the married variety. The whole reads more like an extract from a book than the product of Josephus' own observations,¹⁶ and this impression is strengthened by a comparison with other sources (Philo, Pliny). In the sequel the Pharisees and Sadducees are dispatched in a single paragraph (ii. 8, 14):

Of the two previous schools (ii. 8, 1 f.) the Pharisees, who have the reputation of interpreting the regulations (*νόμιμα*) with exactness and lead the first school, attribute everything to fate and to God. To do right or the contrary lies chiefly in men's power, but fate is auxiliary in each particular case. . . .¹⁷ The Sadducees, the second group, deny fate altogether, and hold God beyond doing or not doing anything evil.¹⁸ They say that good and evil lie open to men's choice, and every individual can attain either according to his own will.¹⁹

In the eighteenth book of the Ancient History, again with mention of the three native philosophies which the Jews had had for a long time and a reference to his description of them in the second book of the War, Josephus begins with a sentence or two about the simple and reasonable living of the Pharisees,²⁰ their respect for their seniors, and their deference to the opinions of their predecessors (in contrast to the unmannerly dis-

¹⁵ Above, p. 373. See Mark 12, 13-17 and parallels.

¹⁶ Vita, c. 2.

¹⁷ Here comes a sentence on the Pharisees' doctrine of a future life: "Every soul is imperishable (*ἀφθαρτον*), but only the soul of the good passes into another body, while that of the bad is punished with eternal torment."

¹⁸ 'Evil' is probably here to be taken in the sense of 'harmful.'

¹⁹ Here follows the Sadducean doctrine of the hereafter: "They deny the lasting existence of the soul and the punishments and rewards in Hades." The friendly concord of the Pharisees among themselves is contrasted with the rudeness of the Sadducees.

²⁰ In these points an affinity with the Stoics is perhaps intimated; note particularly the hegemony of reason (*λόγος*). See Josephus, Vita, c. 2 (end).

putatiousness of the Sadducees). Coming then to their attitude toward Fate, he is apparently endeavoring to make plainer what he had said on this subject in the War twenty years or more earlier:

Though holding that all things are brought about by Fate, they do not deprive the volitional faculty of human nature of its impulse to do them, it having seemed good to God that there should be a concurrence,²¹ and that to its (*i.e.* Fate's) deliberation that of men also, in the exercise of individual volition,²² should accede, with (the concomitant of) virtue or vice.²³

The striking thing in these passages is that the Jewish sects (as we are in the habit of calling them) should be primarily characterized by their attitude toward fate, and especially strange is the exposition of the doctrine of the Pharisees on this point. Other differences among them both in teaching and in mode of life are included in the descriptions of them in the second book of the War and in the eighteenth book of the History, particularly about what becomes of men after death;²⁴ but these are independent of the fundamental difference about fate, and with them we are not here concerned.

In other places in Josephus the word *Heimarmene* ('Fate') is used in ways and connections which make no difficulty. Thus, when everything seemed to point to Vespasian's accession to the empire, "Fortune (*τύχη*) proceeding everywhere as he

²¹ *Κράσιν*, Niese *κρίσιν*; cf. (earlier in the paragraph) *ὧν τε ὁ λόγος κρίνας παρέδωκεν ἀγαθῶν ἔπονται τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ*.

²² Something like this seems to be meant. The manuscripts offer *τῷ θελήσαντι*, τὸ ἐθέλησαν. Niese conjectures *τῷ θελήσονται*.

²³ *Πράσσεσθαι τε εἰμαρμένη τὰ πάντα ἀξιοῦντες οἷδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὁρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται δοκῆσαν τῷ θεῷ κρίσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἐκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῷ ἐθέλησαντι προσχωρεῖν μετ' ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας* (Niese's text). If the sense is rightly interpreted above, the Pharisees made the moral quality of men's actions depend on their assent to the impulse; by this they became responsible. We should then have something like the theory of *kasb* ('appropriation') by which some Moslem theologians thought that they reconciled not only foreordination, but the immediate divine causation ('creation'), of every act of man with the freedom of the will, or, in their way of putting it, with man's ability to produce acts. We might then imagine that the Pharisees were thinking of the 'evil impulse' within (*עַל הָרָע*), man's assent to which makes the evil deed his own. But we may well hesitate to draw such large inferences from the text which lies before us.

²⁴ Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 11; Ant. xviii. 1, 5 (Essenes); B. J. ii. 8, 14; Ant. xviii. 1, 3 (Pharisees); B. J. ii. 8, 14; Ant. xviii. 1, 4 (Sadducees).

would wish and things mostly conspiring with it, gave him reason to think that not without divine providence (οὐ δίχα δαιμονίου προνοίας) would he grasp empire, but that some just fate (δικαία τις εἰμαρμένη) was bringing around the rule of the world to him" (Bell. Jud. iv. 10, 7), the conception and expression are altogether in character, however Josephus may have thought of the confirmation of his own interpretation of Old Testament prophecies in that sense (Bell. Jud. iii. 8, 9).²⁵ He can say that what God has decreed is 'fated,' as in Bell. Jud. vi. 4, 5, § 250:

God had long ago foreordained (κατεψήφιστο)²⁶ the destruction of the temple by fire, but now, in the revolutions of time, the fated day (ἡ εἰμαρμένη ἡμέρα) had arrived, the tenth of the month Lous.

In the classification of the Jewish philosophies, however, addressed as it is to Greek and Roman readers, it is fair to assume that the term Heimarmene is used in what was at least meant to be its philosophical definition. What would an educated reader in his time have understood by it?

The word owed its currency to the Stoics. The notion of a Destiny to which gods as well as men are subject is old; it is sufficient to allude to the Homeric Moira.²⁷ It acquired philosophic import in Stoicism. In this conception of it, it was the eternal, unalterable, causal nexus of the universe; as what we call the 'uniformity of nature' it was Nature itself (φύσις); looked at in terms of cause and effect it was Necessity (ἀνάγκη);²⁸ while considered theologically, as the ordering of the all-pervading dynamic Reason (λόγος) of the world, it could be called Providence (πρόνοια).²⁹ A more theistically inclined Stoic could

²⁵ On Heimarmene, iv. 4, 6, § 297; vi. 1, 8, § 84; vi. 2, 1 § 108; vi. 4, 8, § 267 f.

²⁶ Cf. ταύτην ἔθετο τὴν ψῆφον ὁ θεός, Bell. Jud. vii. 8, 7, § 359; καταπαύσεως ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἐψηφισμένης, Ant. xvii. 2, 4.

²⁷ In the apologetic pamphlet Contra Apionem (ii. 34, § 250) Josephus, satirizing the Greek gods, tells of Zeus κρατούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης.

²⁸ What we call 'the laws of heredity,' which play so large a part in modern fatalism, did not enter into their consideration.

²⁹ Seneca, Nat. Quaest. ii. 45. He continues: Vis illum fatum vocare, non errabis. Hic est, ex quo suspensa sunt omnia, causa causarum. Vis illum providentiam dicere, recte dices. Est enim, cuius consilio huic mundo providetur, ut inoffensus exeat et actus suos explicet. Vis illum naturam vocare, non peccabis. Hic est ex quo

call it Jupiter, understanding by the name not the Jupiter of mythology or of the cultus (*qualem in Capitolio et in ceteris aedibus colimus*), but *rectorem custodemque universi, animum ac spiritum mundi, operis huius dominum et artificem, cui nomen omne convenit*.

It will be sufficient to quote one or two definitions.

Fatum, quod *είμαρμένην* Graeci vocant, ad hanc ferme sententiam Chrysippus, Stoicae princeps philosophiae, definit: "Fatum est," inquit, "sempiterna quaedam et indeclinabilis series rerum et catena, volvens semetipsa sese et implicans per aeternos consequentiae ordines, ex quibus apta nexaque est" (Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, vii. 2, 1).³⁰

Cicero, who had heard Poseidonius in Rhodes, gives the following definition:

Fieri igitur omnia fato ratio cogit fateri. Fatum autem id appello quod Graeci *είμαρμένην*, id est, ordinem seriemque causarum, cum causae causa nexa rem ex se gignat. Ea est ex omni aeternitate fluens veritas³¹ sempiterna. Quod cum ita sit, nihil est factum quod non futurum fuerit, eodemque modo nihil est futurum cuius non causas id ipsum efficientes natura contineat. Ex quo intelligitur, etc. (*De Divinatione* i. 125. For parallels see the notes of A. S. Pease in his edition, pp. 320-322.)

The Stoics gave a prominent place in their theory to the endless series of concatenated causes, connecting the name *είμαρμένη* with *είρμός*, an etymology which prevailed over the earlier connection of the word with *είρημένη*.³²

Controversialists³³ were not slow to point out that the neces-

nata sunt omnia, cuius spiritu vivimus. Vis illum vocare mundum, non falleris. Ipse enim est hoc quod vides totum, partibus suis inditus, et se sustinens et sua. Cf. *Nat. Quaest.* ii. 36; *De Benef.* iv. 7, 1 f.; 8, 3; *Epist.* 19, 6, etc.

³⁰ Gellius gives, ostensibly from memory, Chrysippus' own words in the fourth book of his *Περὶ Προγνῶστας*: *είμαρμένην* esse dicit *φυσικὴν τινα σύνταξιν τῶν ὄλων ἐξ αἰδίου τῶν ἑτέρων τοῖς ἑτέροις ἐπακολουθούντων καὶ μεταπολουμένων, ἀπαραβάτου οὐσης τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιπλοκῆς*.

³¹ On this use of veritas (*ἀλήθεια*) as equivalent to *αἰτία*, *φύσις*, *ἀνάγκη*, etc., see Stobaeus, *Eclog.* i. 79, 1 (ed. Wachsmuth); v. Arnim, No. 913. If we had to translate it in modern terms, we should probably say 'reality.'

³² See Stoic. *Vet. Frag.*, No. 176.

³³ The arguments of Carneades, Epicurus, and (within the Stoic school) Diodorus of Tarsus against Chrysippus are summarized in Cicero's *De Fato*. Epicurus saw no way to escape admitting Fate (and necessity) except by denying the logical principle of the excluded middle, and physically by the 'swerve' of the atoms for which no cause could be assigned. That the initial oblique swerve of the atoms was very small does not remove the difficulty.

sitarianism of the Stoics abolished moral responsibility, and that to punish men for doing what they cannot help doing is manifestly unjust:

Si Chrysippus . . . fato putat omnia moveri et regi nec declinari transcendique posse agmina fati et volumina, peccata quoque hominum et delicta non suscensenda neque inducenda sunt ipsis voluntatibusque eorum, sed necessitati cuidam et instantiae, quae oritur ex fato (Aul. Gellius, vii. 2, 5).

Chrysippus endeavored to maintain the dogma of the school that nothing comes to pass except in consequence of "antecedent causes," and on the other hand that some things are in our own power and that it depends on us whether they come to pass or not,³⁴ by distinguishing two kinds of causes:³⁵

Chrysippus autem cum et necessitatem improbaret, et nihil vellet sine praepositis causis evenire, causarum genera distinguit, ut et necessitatem effugiat et retineat fatum. Causarum enim, inquit, aliae sunt perfectae et principales, aliae adiuvantes et proximae. Quamobrem cum dicimus omnia fato fieri causis antecedentibus, non hoc intelligi volumus, causis perfectis et principalibus, sed causis adiuvantibus, antecedentibus et proximis.

Although the latter causes are not in our power, Cicero adds:

non sequitur ut ne adpetitus³⁶ quidem sit in nostra potestate.

In illustration of his distinction Chrysippus supposes a cylinder — we might imagine a drum of a fallen column — to be lying near the edge of an incline; a man sees it, and that he could push it over the edge, and the sight of it occasions in him an impulse to start it rolling. This impulse, though not without a cause — the sight of the opportunity — is not compulsory; that anything should come of it, there must be *assent* on the man's part. When once he has started it down the slope, it rolls on its way under causes (its shape, the slope, what we call the force of gravity) with which the man has nothing to do;³⁷

³⁴ Cf. Josephus, Ant. xiii. 5, 9; Cicero, De Fato, c. 19, § 45.

³⁵ Cicero, De Fato, c. 18, § 41; cf. Aul. Gellius, vii. 2, 6 ff. According to the latter, Chrysippus held, "Quamquam ita sit, ut ratione quadam necessaria et principali coacta et connexa sit fato omnia, ingenia tamen ipsa mentium nostrarum proinde sunt fato obnoxia, ut proprietates eorum est ipsa et qualitas." Note the following development of the last clause.

³⁶ 'Adpetitus' is here put for *ὁρμή* in the technical sense.

³⁷ See Cicero, De Fato, cc. 18, 19.

these are "adjuvant and proximate causes"; the *causa perfecta et principalis* is the man who by his *assensio* to the *adpetitus* started it on its descent. Cicero sums up:

Omninoque cum haec sit distinctio, ut quibusdam in rebus vere dici possit, cum hae causae antegressae sint, non esse in nostra potestate, quin illa eveniant, quorum causae fuerint. Quibusdam autem in rebus, causis antegressis, in nostra tamen esse potestate, ut aliud aliter eveniat.³⁸

Cicero's criticism of this argument we need not here repeat. In a passage (not now found in our incomplete copies of *De Fato*) quoted by Aulus Gellius (vii. 2, 15) he said:

Chrysippus aestuans laboransque quonam hoc modo explicet, et fato omnia fieri et esse aliquid in nobis, intricatur.³⁹

For Heimarmene in the definition of the schools there was no equivalent word in Hebrew — and no corresponding conception.⁴⁰ Jewish determinism, as far as it went, was theological, not philosophical. Things were determined by the will of God, and his decision was embodied in a decree (גזירה) of the sovereign ruler of the world. The Essenes, who are described as thorough-going determinists, left everything in the power of God;⁴¹ the Sadducees, complete libertarians, held that God was beyond doing anything evil.⁴² In consequence of the personal and moral conception of God in Judaism, God's decree was not irrevocable; the God of the Bible was not incapable of changing his mind on good reason, and the best reason is a change in the conduct and character of men. A homilist of the third century names three things which annul a dire decree: prayer, charity, repentance; the public fasts when the autumnal rains did not set in at the expected season and the institution of the penitential days at New Year's culminating in the

³⁸ *De Fato*, c. 19, § 45.

³⁹ The importance to our happiness of thus distinguishing what is in our power (ἐφ' ἡμῖν) and what is not will be familiar to all readers of Marcus Aurelius.

⁴⁰ This difficulty appears in the recent Hebrew translation of the *War* from the Greek by Shemchuni. He can do no better than render εἰμαρμένῃ by גזירה, 'decree' (of God), putting the Greek word in a note and explaining it by הישגחה, which is modern Hebrew for 'providence.'

⁴¹ Above, p. 371.

⁴² Above, p. 374.

Day of Atonement are evidence of the belief that public and private repentance was effectual with God.⁴³

Philo has an instructive passage on astral fatalism, evidently in a Stoic adaptation of the doctrine:

Making earthly things correspond to things overhead and celestial to terrestrial, and exhibiting as through musical principles the most harmonious symphony of the universe by the association and sympathy⁴⁴ with one another of the parts widely sundered in place but in kinship not severed. They surmise that this phenomenal world is essentially one, either being itself God or including in itself God, the soul of the universe. By making gods of Fate and Necessity they have filled human life with great impiety, teaching that aside from the causes that are perceived there is no other cause at all, but that the revolutions of the sun and moon and other stars distribute to every man both what is good and the contrary (*De Migratione Abrahami*, c. 32, ed. Mangey I, 464).

For Palestinian Judaism in the times of Josephus evidence cannot be adduced; the so-called rabbinical sources begin to flow in any volume only after the fall of Jerusalem. The aphorism (*Abot* 3, 15) attributed to Akiba (died ca. 134 A.D.), "Everything is foreseen (*צפוי*),⁴⁵ and the power of choice (*הרשות*) is given (to man)" — God's foreknowledge is not foreordination of men's actions, will occur to everyone. Of similar purport are the words of Sirach:

Say not, It was the Lord's fault that I fell away . . . say not, He led me astray. . . . He made man from the beginning, and left him to his own counsel (*διαβούλιον*). . . . Before man are life and death, and whichever he chooses will be given him (*Ecclus.* 15, 11-17).

The Psalms of Solomon, probably originating in Pharisaic circles in the middle of the first century B.C. have the same doctrine:

Our deeds are in the election and power of our soul, to do righteousness or unrighteousness in the works of our hands" (9, 7-9).⁴⁶

The presumptions of the Synoptic Gospels are the same. In fact, the power of religious and moral self-determination and the consequent responsibility of man for his conduct is written through and through the Scriptures; and in making man with

⁴³ G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, II, p. 67. See also I, pp. 454-456.

⁴⁴ Technical Stoic term.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Matt.* 10, 29.

⁴⁶ See *Judaism*, I, pp. 453-456.

this power God, so to speak, put a limitation on his own omnipotence.

On foreordination and its limits a bit of Haggadah in the name of R. Ḥanina bar Papa (third century) may be quoted.

When a child is conceived, the angel who is appointed over that function asks God what its lot shall be, strong or weak, wise or foolish, rich or poor, and God decides all these things. The question whether the future man shall be wicked or righteous is not raised; R. Ḥanina said, "Everything is in the power of Heaven except the fear of Heaven" — God can do everything except make a man religious. *That* man must determine for himself, and it is the substance of God's demand (Deut. 10, 12).⁴⁷

In the Tanḥuma Midrash on Exod. 38, 22 (Pekudè, § 3) ⁴⁸ this is found in an ampler form. All the souls that have been from Adam on and that shall be to the end of the world altogether were created in the six days of creation; they are all in paradise (גן עדן), and were all present at the giving of the Law (Deut. 29, 15).⁴⁹ On the night of conception, God decides over the drop of semen in the charge of the same angel, whether the child to be conceived shall be male or female, weak or strong, poor or rich, short or tall, ugly or handsome, stout or thin, despicable or proud; and similarly He decides about all that shall befall him; but not whether he shall be righteous or wicked. This He puts in the power of man alone (Deut. 30, 15). Then God sends the angel to fetch from paradise such and such a spirit named so and so, and show him thus and so. When the spirit is brought, God, against its protestation that it is satisfied with the abode it has been in since its creation, makes it enter the drop of semen. . . .⁵⁰ The angel takes him to paradise and shows him the righteous sitting in glory with their

⁴⁷ Niddah 16b.

⁴⁸ The passage is one of the additions in the Mantua edition; it is not in the preceding editions nor in the manuscripts on which Buber's edition is based. See Buber's Introduction, 86a, n. 3. It is interesting on other accounts, the microcosm-macrocosm, the analogies between embryology and cosmogony, and the seven ages of man (not the scheme familiar to us).

⁴⁹ When the 'preëxistence of souls' in the Wisdom of Solomon is discussed, it would be advisable to take the possibilities of Jewish midrash into account as well as Greek philosophy. The connection with Prov. 4, 3 should not be overlooked.

⁵⁰ The intervening sentence seems in another version to have been the end of the story.

crowns on their heads, explaining to him that these were in like manner fashioned in their mother's womb and came out into the world, and kept the law and the commandments, whereby they became worthy and were bidden to this good which thou seest. "Know that in the end thou too wilt depart from the world, and if thou art worthy and keepest the law of God, thou wilt attain to the same and to the assembly (ישיבה) of these; and if not, know that thou wilt attain to another place." Then the angel conducts him to Gehenna and shows him the wicked, whom the tormenting angels are lashing with scourges of fire, crying out in pain, but finding no compassion. To this vision also the angel attaches the suitable moral, and admonishes his charge, when he is born into the world, to be righteous not wicked, and thus attain to the life of the World to Come. The angel also transports him through all the world and shows him the place where he will die and where he will be buried, and the righteous and the wicked. At birth, however, the child forgets all that it has seen or known.

Elaborated midrash such as this must be taken for what it is, homiletical ingenuity exhibited in getting out of texts what is not in them,⁵¹ and it need hardly be said that it is not adduced as evidence of notions that were current in the days of Josephus. But on the only point with which we are here concerned, the moral self-determination of man, these ideas are in accord with the consistent teaching of Scripture, and the words of the proof-texts from Deuteronomy (especially 30, 15) seem to have been in the mind of Sirach.⁵²

How Josephus came, in the three passages quoted above, to classify the Jewish "philosophies" of his time by their attitude severally toward Fate is a matter of guess-work, and what I have to submit are guesses, to which I would not give a fictitious value by calling them 'hypotheses.' I have remarked that for the word 'Heimarmene' there is no equivalent in Hebrew, and that in the sense in which in an account of the Jewish philosophies it would presumably be understood by educated readers

⁵¹ A very good illustration of this art is the use made of Job 9, 10.

⁵² Above, p. 380.

it was a conception alien to all Jewish thinking that we know anything about.

In the order of Josephus' writings the earlier of these passages is that in the second book of the War (ii. 8, 2-14),⁵³ written in the first years of his residence in Rome. At that time he cannot be presumed to have been capable of producing the kind of literary Greek which we read in the War;⁵⁴ at a much later period he tells us (*Contra Apionem*, i. 9, §50) of the assistants he employed for the sake of the Greek. We might suppose, then, that he gave them in his way an account of the distinctive opinions of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and left them to express it in their own way. 'Heimarmene' might well seem to them the most appropriate word to use for determination as such, and Josephus' acquaintance with philosophy will hardly have been sufficient to make him aware how incompatible it was with Jewish religious thought. One may even imagine that, in the singular clause in which it is said that the Pharisees *είμαρμένη τε καὶ θεῶ προσάπτουσι πάντα*, the words *καὶ θεῶ* are a correction introduced at the instance of Josephus to give God something to do with it. It is, of course, possible that in conversation with his literary advisers Josephus himself used the word 'Heimarmene', understanding by it, as a Jew, divine determinism, not Fate in the Stoic sense. The propensity to use high-sounding words imperfectly comprehended, without concern for the meaning which more intelligent hearers or readers attach to them, is a common infirmity to which a foreign language offers large opportunities.

On the whole, however, I am more inclined to a different guess, namely that the classification of the Jewish 'philosophies' by their attitude toward Fate came originally from a foreign source. The indebtedness of Josephus in the first book of the War and part of the second to the historical work of Nicolaus of Damascus is generally recognized by the critics, and has as high a degree of probability as is attainable in such matters. I suspect that the passage in *Ant.* xiii. 5, 9⁵⁵ about the three philosophical schools which existed among the Jews

⁵³ Above, p. 374.

⁵⁴ For his own account of his Greek, see *Ant.* xx. 11, 2.

⁵⁵ Above, p. 371.

in the time of Jonathan is in fact taken directly from Nicolaus, and as far as I can see without any change, down to Josephus' reference to his previous description in the Jewish War. In discussing that passage I have pointed out that it is irrelevant in its present context; that it mentions no other peculiarities of the sects than their different doctrines about Fate; and that it makes the Essenes thoroughgoing fatalists, of which there is in Josephus elsewhere no suggestion. All these things would be explicable enough in a general historian in Herod's time, who was trying to give his readers a brief account of Jewish sects in terms of current Greek philosophical controversies. His Heimarmene passed over into Josephus' accounts in the War and in the eighteenth book of the Ancient History, supplemented by other differences which are ignored in Ant. xiii. 5, 9,⁵⁶ and with explanations which do not make the attitude of the Pharisees any plainer to us.

The word and idea of Heimarmene are not the only problem presented in these passages. Does the statement in Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 14, §163, that to do right or wrong lies principally in the power of men, but in each particular case Fate is auxiliary (*βοηθεῖν*), involve Chrysippus' distinction of principal and adjuvant causes? Is *ὁρμή* in Ant. xviii. 1, 3, § 13 used in the technical Stoic sense (Cicero's *adpetitus*); and does *προσχωρεῖν* in the same passage imply the doctrine of *assensio*, the technical term for which is *συγκατάθεσις*? In short, are the Heimarmene passages in the War and especially in Antiquities xviii not merely un-jewish but specifically Stoic in the line of the Chrysippean development, or modification, of the doctrine of the school?

If so, it might be imagined that Josephus wished to explain and qualify the statement in Ant. xiii. 5, 9 about the Pharisees, bringing it into closer accord with Jewish conceptions, and that his literary assistants expressed his suggestions, for Greek readers, by the Greek terms for what they regarded as equivalent ideas, terms furnished (though from very different premises) by Chrysippus and current in the Stoicism of their time.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Nicolaus was not unacquainted with other characteristics of the Pharisees as a party; but apparently did not regard them as of philosophical interest.

⁵⁷ The phraseology throughout and in all three passages gives evidence of familiarity with Stoic terminology; and in other respects of accommodation to Greek con-

The kind of Fatalism that was most widely current at the beginning of our era, was the doctrine that a man's temperament (and therewith his behavior) as well as his fortunes were determined by the stars — astral fatalism. The Babylonians had from remote times practised divination by various celestial ('meteoric') phenomena, chiefly, if not exclusively, to predict the fortunes of rulers and kingdoms, campaigns of armies, and the like affairs of public concern, and they developed a science of astrology, the interpretation of astronomical observations as omens. A particular branch, or application, of astrology was genethliology, which undertook to foretell events in the life of an individual in private station by his 'horoscope,' the positions of the stars at the hour of his birth (*natalicia*). This art, whose professors were called 'Chaldaeans,'⁵⁸ with the prestige of immemorial antiquity and the pretensions of exact science, spread westward, and, notwithstanding attempts to restrain it by legislation, was resorted to by high and low.

The Stoics, who took divination under the special patronage of their philosophy, included this art also. There was, in fact, no sphere of nature in which eternal and unalterable law seemed to be so manifest as in the movements and configurations of the heavenly bodies. The Stoics discoursed on the *συνπάθεια τῶν ὀλῶν* with a profundity which imposed on themselves. Panaetius was an exception;⁵⁹ but Poseidonius, in this as in other points, reverted to the orthodoxy of the school.

Not only was destiny *written* in the stars, to be read by those who were expert in deciphering the celestial hieroglyphs; it was *determined* by the stars, which in ancient religion were potent deities, benign or malign, or ambiguous, according to their positions and combinations and their prepotencies. Heimarmene thus became *astral* Fate, and the high philosophy of universal law in nature made alliance with superstition and

ceptions. When the soul of the good is said *μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα* (B. J. ii. 8, 14), the Pharisees' doctrine of the revivication of the dead (in the same body), for which no intelligible Greek expression could be found, is transformed into a *μετεν-σωμάτωση* (transmigration). Cf. also Ant. xviii. 1, 3 (*ῥηστώνην τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν*), which a Greek would probably have understood in the same way.

⁵⁸ In the laws, also 'mathematici' ('calculators').

⁵⁹ Cicero, De divinatione, ii. 42, § 88.

charlatanry. These powers are the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, the rulers of this age, of whom Paul⁶⁰ writes—demonic powers, not divine—but into that chapter we have no occasion here to digress.

The Jews had ample opportunity to become acquainted with Babylonian astrology and its Western developments. There are passages in the prophets which are commonly—and probably rightly—thought to be aimed at the religion which made gods of the stars and at the Chaldaean stargazers and their science of divination. God created all the stars in the sky; He musters their host by number; He calls them out by name; powerful as they are not one of them fails at His command to take its place in the ranks (Isaiah 40, 26). Those who lay off the sky in regions and gaze at the stars, predicting from them what shall befall, are challenged to stand up and deliver their clients from the catastrophe God is about to bring upon their nation (Is. 47, 13).⁶¹

Another verse in the same book (Is. 49, 14) leads a Palestinian rabbi of the third century to speak of the twelve signs (constellations) of the Zodiac, and of the millions of stars of different ranks (magnitudes?)—how can God, who created all these for Israel, forsake or forget Zion, as she complains?⁶²

The belief that a man's constellation (מזל) determines his fortunes made its way, however, into Jewish circulation also; see Shabbat 156a-b. There we may learn what a man will be who is born on a given day of the week (first, second, third, and so on) according to a tablet (πίναξ) of R. Joshua ben Levi. R. Ḥanina held that it was not the constellation of the day, but that of the hour,⁶³ which was decisive. R. Ḥanina is said to have taught that one man's constellation makes him learned, another's makes him rich, and so on.⁶⁴ On the question whether

⁶⁰ Cf. also Ephesians 6, 12.

⁶¹ The difficulties which this verse presents do not affect the certainty of the reference to astrology, which was recognized by the Greek translators.

⁶² Berakot 32b.

⁶³ Each hour of each day having its presiding planet; see Dio Cassius xxxvii. 19; and Boll, art. 'Hebdomas,' in *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VII, 2547 ff., esp. 2560 f.

⁶⁴ Phrases outlive ideas. When a Jew to-day politely salutes another with מזל טוב, he wishes him good health or success, with no reminiscence of the original astrological significance.

Israel as a nation has such a constellation there was a difference between him and R. Johanan, the former affirming it, while the latter maintained that Israel was not under the fatal power of any star, quoting Jer. 10, 2, "Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the (heathen) nations, and be not dismayed at the signs in the sky, for the nations are dismayed at them." Rab was of the same way of thinking, and extended it to the individual Israelites, citing Abraham as an example. To God's prediction of the birth of an heir of his body (Isaac) the patriarch replied, "Lord of the world, I have observed through my astrology⁶⁵ that I am incapable of begetting a son." God answers, "Get away from your astrology. Israel has no fatal star. What is your notion? Because Jupiter⁶⁶ is standing in the west? I will make it go around and stand for you in the east (Is. 41, 2)". A similar opinion of the emancipation of Israel from astral fate is attributed to Samuel, with all the more weight because he was famous for his astronomical learning; it may be inferred that it was entertained also by Akiba, being in both cases illustrated by stories proving the truth of Prov. 10, 2 (צדקה תציל ממות).

The parties named in these expositions and discussions (with exception of Akiba) are scholars of the third century, and therefore not witnesses to what was thought or taught in the first; but the whole tenor of the Old Testament history and prophecy made astral fatalism, apart from its heathenish origin and character, incompatible with Jewish monotheism.

I have quoted above a passage from Philo;⁶⁷ I will quote another, which incidentally shows that he knew some Jews who were in this particular not uninfluenced by the atmosphere of contemporary thought.

On Gen. 15, 16, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again, for the sins of the Amorites are not yet full," Philo remarks:

⁶⁵ אִיצְטָנְיוֹת. The word is unknown, but that astrological divination is intended is clear; compare the references to Pharaoh's astrologers. On Abraham's astrological attainments and God's disapproval of the art see Ginzberg's "Legends of the Jews," V, p. 227, no. 108, especially Gen. R. 44, 10-12.

⁶⁶ צֶדֶק 'righteousness'; as a proper name, the planet Jupiter.

⁶⁷ Above, p. 380.

This [last] clause gives the weaker brethren occasion to infer that Moses posits Fate and Necessity as the causes of all events. As a philosopher and prophet we may be sure that he knew the series, the concatenation, and the complexity of causes; but he did not ascribe to these the causation of all events. On the contrary, he conceives another and earlier Being, enthroned above the universe, like a helmsman or a charioteer; for this Being steers the world-ship in which all voyage, and guides the winged chariot, the whole heaven, by his independent, unlimited ruling power.⁶⁸

A good illustration of the conception and expression of the inevitable on the premises of Judaism, and of the necessary inferences from it, is to be read in the story of Ahab's death in Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 15, 4–6. The 'Must-be' (τὸ χρεών) is here neither Fortune (τύχη) with its combination of aleatory chances nor Fate (εἰμαρμένη) with its eternal and inevitable concatenation of causes, but the will of God revealed by the prophets.

Two predictions of the scene and circumstance of Ahab's death were apparently irreconcilable. Elijah had connected the king's death, as a striking instance of poetical justice, with Naboth's vineyard at Jezreel (1 Kings 21, 19; *Jos. Ant.* viii. 13, 8); Micaiah ben Imlah foretold that the king — and he alone — would fall in battle with the Syrians in his campaign for the recovery of Ramoth Gilead (1 Kings 22, 17; *Jos. Ant.* viii. 15, 4). This conflict of predictions was argued by Zedekiah, one of the false prophets who had unanimously prognosticated the king's success in his enterprise, to discredit the prediction of Micaiah (*Ant.* viii. 15, 4). The event, as narrated in 1 Kings 22 (*Ant.* viii. 15, 5 f.), signally verified the words of both Elijah⁶⁹ and Micaiah.

The comments in Josephus are instructive:

For the 'Must-be' [τὸ χρεών] prevailed, I opine, and made the false prophets obtain more credence than the true one, in order that it might take occasion to accomplish its end (cf. 1 Kings 22, 19 ff.). [It brought to naught the ruse by which Ahab planned to thwart the prediction of Micaiah;] the 'Must-be' found him notwithstanding his disguise.

Since what had been said by two prophets befell Ahab, we must think great things of the Divine [τὸ θεῖον] and honor and reverence it in all cases.

⁶⁸ *Quis rerum divinarum heres*, c. 60 (ed. Mangey I, 516).

⁶⁹ 1 Kings 22, 38 transfers the washing of the chariot and thus the fulfilment of Elijah's prophecy to the city of Samaria, where Ahab was buried. The origin of this confusion is here irrelevant.

. . . Again, from what happened in the case of the king is to be inferred the might of the 'Must-be,' which it is impossible to escape even if the outcome be known beforehand.⁷⁰ It gets the better of human souls by flattering them with fair hopes, by which it brings them into a position where they can be overcome (cf. 1 Kings 22, 19 ff.). So Ahab was deceived by it, and lost his life by disbelieving those who gave unfavorable predictions and lending faith to those who prophesied what pleased him.

What is for our purpose most significant in these passages is that τὸ χρεών is equivalent to τὸ θεῖον; the 'Must-be,' the Inevitable, is the Deity. It may not be superfluous to remark that here as elsewhere in this book of the Ancient History the pragmatism of the Book of Kings is adhered to in idea and expression; see, for instance, Ant. viii. 12, 6.

⁷⁰ Chrysippus is reported to have drawn the same inference from the examples of Oedipus and Alexander son of Priam. Laios and Priam had been fully and explicitly warned by oracle; they tried to frustrate the prediction by exposing the infants, but in vain. "Thus the prediction of the evils was of no profit even to them, on account of the necessity there is in Fate" (διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐμαρμένης αἰτίας); v. Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, 939 (I, pp. 270 f.).

NOTES

A NEWLY DISCOVERED LEAF OF THE FREER PSALTER

Among the parchment leaves which formed a large part of a purchase made by the late Professor Francis W. Kelsey early in 1927 I later found one of the missing leaves of the Freer Psalter, published in 1917. The bundle was made up of parchment and paper leaves, all, with this one exception, comparatively late and not of great value. Most of them are more or less damaged and have no connection with one another, evidently representing a variety of finds or purchases. They came from M. Nahman, an antiquity dealer of Cairo, and were bought by Mr. Kelsey without examination and on the chance that although the bundle looked like the rejected numbers from many sales, examination might reveal something of value.

As soon as I discovered this valuable Psalter fragment I wrote to M. Nahman and later took the matter up through Mr. Peterson, Director of the Michigan Excavation in the Fayoum, to whom a photograph of the leaf was sent. In my publication of the Freer Psalter, page 121, mention was made of a gap between Psalm 146, 9 and Psalm 149, 2 which showed the loss of two leaves at that point. As the last leaves of the manuscript were loose at the time of the purchase of the manuscript, it seemed probable that the loss was modern. Careful search was made among Egyptian dealers in antiquities, both by Mr. Freer on the occasion of two trips to Egypt and by myself in 1913, but without result. M. Nahman also has been able to give no further information. The parchment leaves sold by him to Mr. Kelsey came from many purchases and sales, and he has no record of any of them. The second missing leaf has thus far not been found and the dealer does not know where to search for it. Of course it may already have been sold to some library or collector and be now in Europe, safe but unrecognized. Under these circumstances it seems unnecessary longer to delay publication of the new leaf. It is hoped that by calling attention to the strong probability that the companion leaf is somewhere in existence, the chance of the discovery of it may be increased.

To those possessing the edition of the Freer Psalter this fragment can be described as the one following page 10 of fragment Λ^a , where

the statement is printed in the text, "amissa sunt duo folia." The size of this fragment is 27 by 19 cm. overall, but it is very irregular, being much decayed on the binding edge. It contains Psalm 146, 9 to 148, 1 inclusive. A facsimile of one of the leaves similar to it is given as Plate IX of "The Washington Manuscript of the Psalms," University of Michigan Studies, vol. VIII, where on page 123 a date in the eighth century and an origin near Mt. Sinai are assigned it. On pages 139 ff. of the same volume there is a study of the textual characteristics and value of the fragment Λ^a, so that nothing need be added on that subject here. The reprint of the text, with lacunae and illegible letters filled out in square brackets, follows.

- p. 10a και διδοντι τ]οις κτηνεσιν τρο
 φην α]υτων
 και τ]οις νεοσοις των κορα
 κω]ν τοις επικαλουμενοις
 ον]ομα αυτου
 ουκ εν] τη δυναστεια του ιπ
 π]ου θελησει
 ου]δε εν ταις κνημαις του αν
 δρoς ευδοκει
 ευδ]οκει κς εν τοις φοβουμε
 ν]οις αυτον
 και] επι τοις ελπιζουσιν επι το
 ελεoς αυτου
- [PMZ] ρλ]ληλουϊα αγγεον και ξαχαριου' (in red)
 επα]νει ιλημ τον κν
 αινει] τον θν σου σιων
 οτι ενι]σχυσεν τους μοχλους
 των π]υλων σου
 ευλογησ]εν τους υιους σου εν σοι
 ο τιθεις τα ο]ρια σου ειρηνην
 και στεα]ρ πυρου ενπιμπλων σε
 ο αποστειλλ]ων το λογιον αυτου
 τη γη]
 εως ταχους δ]ραμιτ(αι) ο λογος αυτου
- p. 10b του διδοντος χιον[α ωσει εριον
 ομιχλην ωσει σποδ]ον πασ
 σοντος
 βαλλοντος κρυσταλλ]ον αυτου
 ωσει ψωμους

PMH

κατα προσωπον ψυχο[us αυ
 του τις ὑποστησεται
 αποστελλει τον λογον αυτο[υ
 και τηξι αυτα
 πνευσει το $\overline{\pi\alpha}$ αυτου κα[ι ρυ
 ησονται ὑδατα ∴
 ο απαγγελλων τον λογο[ν
 αυτου τω ἱακωβ'
 δικαιωματα κριματα α[ν
 του τω $\overline{\iota\sigma\lambda}$
 ουκ εποιησεν ουτως [παν
 τι εθνει
 και τα κριματα αυτ[ου ου
 κ εδηλωσεν αυτο[ις
 αλληλουϊα αγγεου κ[αι ζα
 χαριου': (in red)
 αινειτε τον $\overline{\kappa\nu}$ [εκ των
 $\overline{\omicron\nu\nu\omega\nu}$
 αινειτε αυτον [εν τοις νηιστοις

The only notable variants are: 146, 9, *ονομα αυτου* for *αυτον*; 146, 11, *επι* for *εν*, omit *πασιν*; 147, 7, *ρυησονται* for *ρυησεται*; 147, 8, add *ο* before *απαγγελλων*; omit *και*. The first of these is interesting from its ritual implications, and seems not to be found elsewhere in the older manuscripts.

HENRY A. SANDERS

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

BOOKS RECEIVED

- NABONIDUS AND BELSHAZZAR: a Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. *By Raymond Philip Dougherty.* (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XV.) New Haven, Yale University Press, 1929. Pp. xii, 216. \$3.00.
- THE HIGH WAYS TO PERFECTION OF ABRAHAM MAIMONIDES. *By Samuel Rosenblatt.* (Columbia University Oriental Studies, Vol. XXVII.) New York, Columbia University Press, 1927. Pp. 213. \$3.50.
- THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, General Circular, No. 2. Communications, Nos. 2-5. University of Chicago Press.
- TRUTH AND THE FAITH: an Interpretation of Christianity. *By Hartley Burr Alexander.* New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1929. Pp. vi, 313. \$3.00.
- DO WE NEED A NEW RELIGION? *By Paul Arthur Schilpp.* New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1929. Pp. xvii, 325. \$2.50.
- CONFLICTS IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. *By Georgia Harkness.* New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1929. Pp. xv, 326. \$2.00.
- THE BOOK OF PROVERBS, with Introduction and Notes. *By W. O. E. Oesterley.* New York, Dutton & Co., 1929. Pp. lxxxvii, 294. \$6.00.
- ESSAYS IN PHILOSOPHY. *By seventeen Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago.* Edited by T. V. Smith and W. K. Wright. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1929. Pp. xvi, 337. \$3.50.
- CATHOLICISM AND CHRISTIANITY: a Vindication of Progressive Protestantism. *By Cecil John Cadoux.* New York, Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press, 1929. Pp. xl, 708. \$6.00.
- GENIZAH STUDIES, in Memory of Dr. Solomon Schechter. II. Geonic and early Karaite Halakah. *By Louis Ginzberg.* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Vol. VIII.) New York, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1929. Pp. xv, 640, 13.
- WHY I AM A JEW. *By Edmond Fleg.* Translated from the French by Louise Waterman Wise, with a Foreword by Stephen S. Wise. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1929. Pp. xiv, 100. \$1.25.
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MARK, in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Commentary. *By A. W. F. Blunt.* (The Clarendon Bible.) Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1929. Pp. 272. New York, Oxford University Press. \$1.50.
- PALESTINE IN GENERAL HISTORY. *By Theodore H. Robinson, J. W. Hunkin, and F. C. Burkitt.* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1926.) London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1929. Pp. viii, 106. New York, Oxford University Press. \$2.00.
- STUDIES IN EUSEBIUS. *By J. Stevenson.* (Thirlwall Prize Essay, 1927.) Cambridge, University Press, 1929. Pp. vi, 145. New York, Macmillan. \$2.00.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

- THE INTUITION OF GOD: an Introduction to the Philosophy of Mysticism. The Hastie Memorial Lectures delivered at Glasgow University, 1927. By *T. M. Watt*. Edinburgh, Blackwood, 1929. Pp. ix, 135. 5 shillings.
- THE IDEA OF VALUE. By *John Laird*. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1929. Pp. xx, 384.
- FOLKWAYS IN CHINA. By *Lewis Hodous*. London, Arthur Probsthain, 1929. Pp. viii, 248. 12s. 6d.
- JEBAMOT (Von der Schwagerehe): Text, übersetzung und Erklärung nebst einem textkritischen Anhang von *Karl Heinrich Rengstorf*. (Die Mischna hrsg. von Beer, Holtzmann, Krauss. III. Seder. Naschim. 1. Traktat.) Giessen, Töpelmann, 1929. Pp. xii, 56*, 272. Subscription price, 24 marks.
- RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZU DEN IGNATIUSBRIEFEN. By *Heinrich Schlier*. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 8.) Giessen, Töpelmann, 1929. Pp. iv, 188. 10 marks.
- IHEOTΣ BAZIAETΣ OT BAZIAETΣAZ. II. Band. By *Robert Eisler*. (Lief. 17-18). Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1929. Pp. 641-769. 8.80 marks.
- FORSCHUNGEN ZUR ENTSTEHUNG DES URCHRISTENTUMS, DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS UND DER KIRCHE. Hrsg. von *Ernst Barnikol*. II. Die drei Jerusalemreisen des Paulus. Kiel, Walter G. Mühlau, 1929. Pp. 63. 2.50 marks.
- METAPHYSIK ALS WISSENSCHAFT VOM LETZTEN. By *Hugo Dingler*. München, Ernst Reinhardt, 1929. Pp. 290. 11.50 marks.
- LUTHER-JAHREBUCH: Jahrbuch der Luther-Gesellschaft, herausgegeben von *Th. Knolle*. Jahrgang X., 1928. München, Kaiser. Pp. viii, 203.
- VOM WERDEN DER BIBLISCHEN GOTTESANSCHAUUNG UND IHREM RINGEN MIT DEM GOTTESGEDANKEN DER GRIECHISCHEN PHILOSOPHIE. Rektoratsrede. By *Otto Eissfeldt*. Halle, Niemeyer, 1929. Pp. 18.
- SYNOPTISCHE STUDIEN. By *Wilhelm Bussmann*. Zweites Heft: Zur Redenquelle. Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1929. Pp. viii, 213. 14 marks.
- SUMMA PHILOSOPHIAE CHRISTIANAE. By *J. Donat, S.J.* Vol. 2, Critica; 4, Cosmologia; 6, Theodicea; 9. Index generalis. Innsbruck, 1924-1929. 3.60, 5.00, 3.60 marks.
- S. ANSELMI LIBER MONOLOGION recensuit *Franciscus Salesius Schmitt*. (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasc. XX.) Bonn, P. Hanstein, 1929. Pp. vii, 65. 2.80 marks.
- QVAESTIONES DE JUSTIFICATIONE (Gabriel Biel). Edidit *Carolus Feckes*. (Opuscula et Textus, Series scholastica, edita curantibus Grabmann et Pelster. Fasc. iv.) Aschendorff, 1929. Pp. 63. 1.20 marks.
- QVAESTIONES DE REALI DISTINCTIONE INTER ESSENTIAM ET ESSE (Thomas de Sutton). Edidit *F. Pelster*. (Opuscula et Textus, Series scholastica, edita curantibus Grabmann et Pelster. Fasc. v.) Münster, Aschendorff, 1928. Pp. 64. 1.20 marks.
- BIJDRAGE TOT DE PSYCHOLOGIE VAN TERTULLIANUS. By *Gerrit Jacob de Vries*. (Academisch proefschrift, Vrie Universiteit te Amsterdam, 1929.) Utrecht, Kemink en Zoon. Pp. 75.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- DE EGYPTISCHE KERKORDENING EN HIPPOLYTUS VAN ROME. (Dissertation.)
By *Rudolf Lorentz*. Haarlem, Joh. Enschedé en Zonen, 1929. Pp. 187, 3.
- ESSAI SUR L'OBJET RELIGIEUX. By *Charles Hauter*. (Études d'Histoire et de philosophie religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg, No. 17.) Paris, Félix Alcan, 1928. Pp. 281. 35 francs.
- LES DISPERSÉS D'ISRAËL: les Origines de la Diaspora et son Rôle dans la formation du Judaïsme. By *A. Causse*. (Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg, No. 19.) Paris, Félix Alcan, 1929. Pp. 166. 20 francs.
- LA BIBLE DE REUSS ET LA RENAISSANCE DES ÉTUDES D'HISTOIRE RELIGIEUSES EN FRANCE. By *A. Causse*. (Cahiers de la Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, No. 19.) Paris, Félix Alcan, 1929. Pp. 41.
- LA PENSÉE INTUITIVE. I. Au delà du discours. By *Édouard le Roy*. Paris, Boivin & Cie., 1929. Pp. vii, 204. 15 francs.
- BOURDALOUE MORALISTE. By *Ethna Byrne*. Paris, G. Beauchesne, 1929. Pp. 504.
- LA DÉVOTION AU SACRÉ COEUR DE JÉSUS DANS LES ANCIENS ÉTATS DES PAYS-BAS (xii.-xvii. siècle.) By *Ch. G. Kanter*. Bruxelles, Albert Dewit, 1928. Pp. xv, 296. 8 francs.
(The same.) Supplément: Nouvelle Série de Documents de la Belgique et de la Hollande. 1929. Pp. x, 90. 3 francs.
- SACRUM COMMERCIIUM S. FRANCISCI CUM DOMINA PAUPERTATE, *editum a PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae*. Firenze-Quaracchi, Ex Typ. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1929. Pp. 76.

